3 1761 05973620 7

PRESENTED

BY THE

Church of England Book Society,

11, ADAM STREET, LONDON.

FOUNDED 1880.

Treasurer.
FRANK A. BEVAN, ESQ.

Secretary.
JOHN SHRIMPTON, ESQ.

THE

NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE

IN THE

EUCHARIST.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON,
1, GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

R Theol G

THE

NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE

IN THE

EUCHARIST:

OR,

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF

THE REAL PRESENCE

VINDICATED

IN OPPOSITION TO THE FICTITIOUS REAL PRESENCE

ASSERTED BY

ARCHDEACON DENISON, MR. (LATE ARCHDEACON) WILBERFORCE, AND DR. PUSEY:

WITH FULL PROOF OF THE REAL CHARACTER OF THE ATTEMPT MADE BY THOSE AUTHORS TO REPRESENT THEIR DOCTRINE AS THAT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND HER DIVINES.

By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.,
Rector of St. Margaret Lothbury, London.

"To say that the communion of our Lord's body and blood means the receiving his natural flesh and blood into our mouths, *under the forms, accidents, or appearances of bread and wine*, is manifestly a forced and late interpretation; not heard of for eight hundred years or more, and besides absurd, contradictory, and impossible. .... To say that the communion of our Lord's body and blood means the receiving his natural flesh and blood into our mouths, *together with the symbols*, would be running into *the like absurdities with the former*."—Archdeacon Waterland.

"While men SLEPT, the enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way."

VOL. II.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY T. HATCHARD, 187, PICCADILLY.
1856.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/natureofchristsp02gooduoft

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO VOL. II.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE AUTHORIZED FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK ..... 613—755

SECTION I.

Testimony of the Book of Common Prayer ..... 613—637

SECTION II.

Testimony of the Homilies ..... 637—641

SECTION III.

Testimony of the XXXIX Articles ..... 641—687

Review of the Articles themselves ..... 641—665

Extracts from the Expositions of the Articles by Thomas Rogers (665—668), John Elis (669, 670), Bp. Burnet (670—676), Edw. Welchman (676, 677), Dr. Bennet (677), Bishop Beveridge (677—680), Ralph Ford (680—683), J. Veneer (683, 684), Bp. Tomline (684—687).

SECTION IV.

Testimony of the Catechism ..... 687—727

Review of the Catechism itself ..... 687—696

Extracts from the Commentaries on the Catechism by Dr. Mayer (697—701), Dr. R. Sherlock (702), Bp. Nicolson (702—704), The Oxford Catechism (704, 705), Dr. Comber (705, 706), Dr. Simon Ford (706), Bp. Ken (706—710), Bp. Williams (710, 711), Abp. Wake (711—713), J. Lewis (713, 714), Bp. Beveridge (714—716), Dr. E. Wells (716, 717), Bp. Burnet (717, 718), J. Ollyffe (718—720), P. Newcome (720, 721), J. Harrison (721, 722), Archd. Waterland (722, 723), Abp. Secker (723, 724), J. Salter (725), J. Stillingfleet (725, 726), Bp. Mann (726).

SECTION V.

Testimony of the Formularies of secondary authority in our Church.. 727—732

Jewel's Apology ..... 727—732

Nowell's Catechism 732

SECTION VI.

Testimony of certain works that have at different times received public sanction and authority in our Church ..... 732—738

Edward VI. Catechism 732, 733

Reformatio Legum Eccles. ..... 733—735

Bullinger's Decads ..... 735—738

PAGE

APPENDIX.

A.

On the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice maintained by Archdeacon Wilberforce, with evidence of its inconsistency with that of the Fathers ..... 973—978

B.

The Communion Service contained in what are called "The Constitutions of the Apostles," preserved in the Abyssinian Church ..... 978—981

C.

On the subscription to the Augsburg Confession required of Germans ordained by the Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem ..... 981—987

CHAPTER VI.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE AUTHORIZED FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

SECTION I.

Testimony of the Book of Common Prayer.

I NOW proceed to point out what is the doctrine of our Church on the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, as manifested in its authorized Formularies, and to show that it is entirely opposed to that of the Authors under review.

The first Formulary which I shall consider is,—"The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion," in the Prayer-Book, with its accompanying Rubrics.

Archdeacon Wilberforce wishes us to suppose, that it was expressly intended, that this Service, as drawn up for the Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth, should be consistent with the doctrine of the Presence which he maintains; and his proof is, that "it is "the unwilling testimony of Burnet, that the 'Communion Book' "was 'so contrived, that it might not exclude the belief of the "corporal presence; for the chief design of the Queen's Council "was, to unite the nation in one faith, and the greatest part of "the nation continued to believe such a presence.' Elizabeth, "therefore, as he affirms, ordered those statements to be ex-"cluded, by which the worship of Christ's Body, as present in "the Holy Eucharist, might seem to be forbidden."

And in order to get rid of the objection derived from the insertion, in 1662, of the Rubric taken from the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., he adds,—

"And when the Rubric after the Communion Office was intro-

duced from Edward VIth's Second Book, at the last review, (A.D. 1662), its words were altered, at the instance of Dr. Gunning, afterwards Bishop of Ely, on purpose that the question might be left as ambiguous as before."[1]

Now, even supposing that the Service was so drawn up, it would merely prove, that our Reformers, anxious not to prevent the attendance of the Romanists at church by anything that might unnecessarily offend their prejudices, abstained from inserting in the Communion Service any *direct denial* of the corporal presence of Christ. But this would afford no evidence that our Church, even in this Service, *sanctions* the Archdeacon's views. It would merely show, that there is no direct condemnation of them in this particular Service. But the place to which we are to look for a definite statement of the doctrine of the Church of England on the subject is the Thirty-nine Articles; to the reception of which, every minister of our Church is pledged. And what the testimony of those Articles is, we shall consider hereafter.

If what he had to prove had been, that persons holding the doctrine of the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, could conscientiously *attend* this Service of our Church, inasmuch as it contained no express condemnation of their doctrine, and had not the rubric forbidding the worship of the body of Christ as present, then his quotation from Bishop Burnet would have been *relevant*. But beyond that it is useless.

But, in fact, though we may readily admit that there is no *direct denial* of such a presence as the Archdeacon contends for in the Service, exclusive of the rubric, (where, indeed, it was not to be expected,) yet there are passages clearly *inconsistent with the maintenance of it*, and circumstances connected with the drawing up of the Service which decisively prove the views and intentions of our Reformers on the subject.

What these are, I will presently point out.

His criticism on the Rubric, re-introduced in 1662 from Edward's Second Prayer-Book, I shall also consider presently. Its omission in the Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth may very probably have been caused by an unwillingness to insert in that

[1] Charge of 1854, at the end of Sermons on the Holy Communion, pp. 297, 298.

book a *formal denial* of the doctrine of the real substantial presence of Christ's Body.

Archdeacon Denison alleges,—This Service "not only con- "tains no single expression which can be wrested by the most "perverse ingenuity into a denial of that portion of the doctrine "of the Real Presence which is stated in my Proposition, but "it contains very many expressions which have no meaning, "unless it be assumed and allowed that what my Proposition "states is the Truth."[1]

Now I will not reply to this in my own words, but in those of the learned Nonjuror, Dr. Brett, whose views were, to a certain extent, similar to those of the Archdeacon. The remarks of Dr. Brett are founded upon a passage to which Archdeacon Denison, throughout his whole examination of the Service, never once alludes, namely this;—"Grant that we, receiving "*these thy creatures of bread and wine*, according to thy Son our "Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his "death and passion, MAY BE partakers of *his most blessed Body* "*and Blood.*" Here is a solemn prayer to God, that when we partake of the consecrated elements, we "*may be* partakers of "Christ's most blessed Body and Blood;" necessarily implying, that we may partake of the elements *without* being made partakers of Christ's Body and Blood. In fact, if all who partake of the elements do, as the Archdeacon maintains, necessarily partake of Christ's Body and Blood, this prayer becomes a mere mockery. For it is not a prayer for their *worthy* reception of Christ's Body and Blood, or their reception of them so as to be *benefited* by them, but merely a prayer that they *may receive* them. And upon these words Dr. Brett makes the following remarks:—

"I was and am very desirous to believe that the Church of England holds the doctrine so plainly taught by our Saviour. But I know not how to reconcile the Consecration Prayer in the present established Liturgy to this doctrine, for that makes a plain distinction betwixt the Bread and Wine and our Saviour's Body and Blood, when, as Mr. Spinckes shows, and the words will bear no other construction than that, it was the Bread which Christ said was his Body; whereas the Consecration Prayer evidently supposes them to be two distinct things. 'Grant that we, receiving these thy creatures

[1] Serm. 2. p. 87; 3rd ed. p. 58.

of Bread and Wine, may be partakers of Christ's Body and Blood.' Which manifestly implies *the Bread and Wine* to be distinct or different things from *the Body and Blood.* For if the Bread be Christ's Body, as Mr. Spinckes proves the words of Institution teach, then he that receives or partakes of the Bread, must be a partaker of the Body. And except they are supposed to be two things, then the Prayer is, that we, *receiving or partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, may be partakers of His Body and Blood.* This nonsensical interpretation must be given of this Petition, if the Prayer is understood in the sense which Mr. Spinckes declares and proves to be the necessary inevitable consequence of our Saviour's words, and which I verily believe to be so. But the ancient Church, as appears from all the Liturgies, never prayed in this manner. They never prayed, that, *receiving Bread and Wine, they might be partakers of Christ's Body and Blood,* but that they might be *worthy partakers,* that they might partake of it to their benefit, and not to their condemnation." [1]

Such is the statement of a learned divine, holding the doctrine, not of the presence of the natural body and blood of Christ, but of their life-giving virtue, in the consecrated bread and wine, so as to constitute a virtual presence of that body and blood in them, and desirous of finding that the Church of England, in her Communion Service, sanctioned this modified view of the doctrine of a Real Presence. He declares it utterly impossible to reconcile this passage with that view, while Archdeacon Denison informs us, that the Service "contains no single expression which can be wrested by the most perverse ingenuity into a denial" even of *his* doctrine of the Real Presence. Which of the two is in the right, I leave the reader to judge, and cannot but add, that not only is this passage fatal to the supposition that the doctrine here opposed is that of the Church of England, but Archdeacon Denison's prætermission of it, in his examination of our Formularies, shows how superficial or partial his examination of them has been.

I might add other passages from the same Service, which, though not so decisive, still show clearly, though indirectly, that it was drawn up on principles opposed to those of the Authors under review.

[1] BRETT'S Discourse concerning the necessity of discerning the Lord's Body in the Holy Communion. London, 1720. Preface, pp. xix—xxi.

For instance, in a prayer at the conclusion of the Service, those who drew it up evidently intended to intimate that the communication of the Body and Blood of Christ is limited to those who have "*duly received*" the holy mysteries. For the words are,—"We . . . thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe "to feed *us, who have duly received* these holy mysteries, with "the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy "Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." And what renders this passage much more significant is the fact (which I shall presently notice more particularly), that it was *altered* to the expressions now found in it from words that might seem to imply that *all* received the Body and Blood of Christ.

But the most significant evidence derivable from the Communion Service on this subject, is, I think, to be found in the *alterations* made from the first Liturgy of 1549 in the revision of 1552, *and continued in subsequent revisions;* to which therefore I shall now proceed to direct the attention of the reader.

It will be found that in the Second Prayer-Book of Edw. VI. (that of 1552), *and the subsequent ones,* all those expressions in the first Prayer-Book, published in 1549, which might *seem* to indicate, that the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ was to be looked for *in the consecrated elements,* or as so present that all the communicants indiscriminately partook of that Body and Blood, are *carefully expunged or altered.*

Thus, in the Liturgy of 1549, in the address commencing,—"Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind," &c. are the words, —"And to the end that we should alway remember the "exceeding love of our Master and only Saviour, Jesu Christ, "thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his "precious blood-shedding he hath obtained to us, he hath left "in those holy mysteries, as a pledge of his love, and a continual "remembrance of the same, his own blessed Body and precious "Blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort "and consolation." But in the Liturgy of 1552, and the subsequent ones, instead of the words, "he hath left," &c. are these, —"he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love and [and for a, *in ed. of* 1662] continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort;"—

evidently to avoid the use of words which might be interpreted to signify a real presence in the Bread and Wine.

But the most important alteration is in the Prayer of Consecration. In the Liturgy of 1549 occur these words:—"With "thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these "thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, *that they may be* "*unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son* "*Jesus Christ.*" Now, no doubt, these words may be so explained as not to countenance the doctrine of a real presence *in the consecrated elements*, but they are very open to an interpretation of that kind. And accordingly we find Bucer, in his Remarks on the Prayer-Book, written at the request of Archbishop Cranmer for his use in the revision of the book, taking particular exception to them as open to an interpretation involving the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, and he proceeds to use words which exclude Archdeacon Denison's doctrine as much as that of the Romanists. He says,—

"The holy Fathers understood no other change of those elements from these words, than that by which the bread and wine, remaining in every respect in the properties of their own nature, were then so changed from their vulgar and common use, and as it were transelemented, as to be *symbols* (symbola) of the same Body and Blood, and so of Christ himself, God and man, the bread which came down from heaven to give life to the world: so that whoever should take them according to our Lord's institution, and with true faith in him, should be partakers of a fuller communion with the Lord, and enjoy him for the meat and drink of eternal life, by which they might more and more live in him, and have him living in themselves." [1]

Accordingly these words were altered, and *remain altered*, to the very words which we have seen Dr. Brett quoting as proof that the Church of England holds, that the consecrated Bread and Wine may be received where the Body and Blood of Christ are *not* received, and therefore do not include in themselves a real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ; namely the words,—"Grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread "and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's "holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may "be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood."

[1] Bucebi Censura in Ordinat. Ecclesiast. Op. ed. Basil. 1577. p. 471.

Again, immediately after the Prayer of Consecration in the Prayer-Book of 1549, occur the words,—"beseeching thee that "whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may "*worthily receive* the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son "Jesus Christ"—words which might be interpreted to imply the possibility of the wicked and faithless receiving them. But in the subsequent revisions of the Book, this Prayer is altered into,—"beseeching thee, that all we who are partakers of "this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and "heavenly benediction."

So again in the Prayer,—"We do not presume," &c. were the words,—"so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Blood, *in these holy mysteries*," &c. These words might convey the idea, that we ate Christ's flesh and drank his blood in eating and drinking the bread and wine, as I just now remarked, and accordingly, in the subsequent revisions, the words "in these holy mysteries" were omitted.

More especially observable is the following alteration in the Prayer at the end, beginning,—"Almighty and everliving God," &c. In the Prayer-Book of 1549, we find in that Prayer the following words,—"hast vouchsafed to feed us in "these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most "precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus "Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of thy "favour and goodness towards us." In the first and all subsequent revisions these words were changed into the following,—"dost vouchsafe to feed *us which have duly received these* "*holy mysteries* with the spiritual food of the most precious "Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and "dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards "us." A more *expressive* alteration there could not be.

Once more, in the Rubric at the end of the Service as it stood in the Prayer-Book of 1549, occurred the following words respecting the division of the bread:—"And men must not "think less to be received in part, than in the whole, but in "each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesu Christ." In the next and all subsequent revisions these words were omitted.

Thus, all the passages in the Prayer-Book of 1549, which

might be taken to imply, that the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ was to be looked for in, or as annexed and bound by consecration to, the consecrated Bread and Wine, or that the faithless receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper as well as the faithful, *have been altered in all the subsequent revisions*, so as no longer to countenance that view; and no passage can be found in our present Prayer-Book that intimates more than the presence of Christ *in the rite* to the faithful, and the *spiritual* eating and drinking of his Body and Blood, *in the act of communion*, by *the faithful.*

Still further evidence of the doctrine of our Church on this subject, to be found in this portion of its Formularies, is derivable from the Rubrics. The first to which I would call the attention of the reader is, that at the end of the Office for the Communion of the Sick, which is as follows:—"But if a man, "either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of "warning in due time to the Curate, or for lack of company to "receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not "receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the Curate "shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, "and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ has suffered death "upon the Cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemp-"tion, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, "and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth *eat and* "*drink the Body and Blood* of our Saviour Christ profitably to "his soul's health, although he do *not receive the sacrament* "with his mouth."

Now in these words it is clearly admitted, that, under the circumstances here spoken of, a man may eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ without receiving the sacrament at all. Thus much, therefore, is certainly proved by it, that our Church holds, that the Body and Blood of Christ may be received independently of a reception of the consecrated elements, and therefore that there *may be* a reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, though they may not be in the elements.

But the argument raised from this passage, that such *is* the nature of the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in that rite, is met by the argument, that the case contemplated in the

Rubric is a *peculiar* case, in which we may suppose communion with our Lord's Body and Blood to be given in an extraordinary way. And we are reminded[1] of a somewhat similar passage in the Salisbury Manual[2] of Romish times, in which a sick man, unable to communicate, is told in the words of St. Augustine, "Believe and thou hast eaten."

Now these considerations, no doubt, abate the force of the argument from this passage as to the doctrine of our Church, but certainly do not wholly destroy it. The Rubric in the Salisbury Manual was probably inserted there before the doctrine of the Romish Church was fixed according to its present form, and would not probably be received, much less inserted, by the present Church of Rome. The Rubric inserted in our own Prayer-Book was placed there in opposition to the commonly received notion of the time, that actual communion in the Eucharist was necessary to enable a man to feed on the Body and Blood of Christ. Moreover, the admission, that under certain circumstances the Body and Blood of Christ may be received without a participation of the Eucharist, goes a long way to prove, that even when the consecrated elements are partaken of, the Body and Blood of Christ are not supposed to be partaken of as *in* the elements. I am quite ready, however, to admit that the case treated of in the Rubric is a peculiar case, and that consequently any general argument raised out of it is not *conclusive;* and therefore I do not put it forward as a *decisive* evidence on the subject.

But a much more important Rubric is that which occurs at the end of the ordinary Communion Service, which I will first quote entire:—

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ

[1] See Wilberforce's Charge, p. 281.

[2] The following Rubric at the end of the Form of Communion for the Sick; —"Deinde communicatur infirmus, nisi prius communicatus fuerit, et nisi de vomitu, vel alia irreverentia probabiliter timeatur: in quo casu dicat sacerdos infirmo: Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides, et bona voluntas; tantum crede et manducasti." Man. Sarisb. fol. 97. I cite the passage from Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ. 4th ed. 1845. vol. 2. pp. 233, 234.

therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved: It is here declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

Now here we find the mind of our Church distinctly declared on two points;—first, that in the Eucharist there must be no adoration paid, either to "the sacramental bread and wine," or to "any corporal [which is equivalent to, bodily] presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood," and that the posture of kneeling used in our Church is only "for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might otherwise ensue;"—secondly, that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and NOT HERE," because it is "against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

In both these points the doctrine of the Authors under review is directly opposed to this Rubric. For these Authors hold, that there is a real substantial presence of Christ's natural body and blood in a supernatural way, in or under the Bread and Wine, to which a doration is due; and that they are so joined to the elements as to be received by the mouth of all the communicants, and therefore are present here at the same time that they are in heaven, in direct opposition to the statement of the Rubric that they are *not here*. And the mode in which it is endeavoured to make this view consistent with the doctrine of the Rubric, namely, by avoiding the use of the phrase "*corporal* presence," and saying that the presence is the presence of the body in a supernatural way, or, a spiritual and

immaterial form, is utterly futile. For, whatever *words* may be used, it is undeniable that a presence of the Body of Christ, such that it is swallowed by the mouth of the communicant, is *a corporal presence*. In fact, the substantial presence of Christ's body is a *bodily* or *corporal* presence, for the word *corporal* is not *more* limited to the sense of something *material* than the word *body* is. And if a human body *can be* present in an immaterial form, there can be a *corporal* presence of an *immaterial* kind. And as to the notion of a natural and a supernatural presence of Christ's Body, by the former of which it is in heaven, and by the latter in the Eucharist, the Rubric admits of no such distinction. Its statement is perfectly general, that it is against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be in two places at the same time. To limit this statement to the meaning, that it cannot be so in a *natural way*, but that, while it can only be present in one place in a natural way, it may be present in an infinite number of places in a *supernatural way*, is a mode of interpretation which would make all dogmatic statements perfectly useless. It is clear, indeed, that the Body of Christ would be in two places at the same time, if it was both in heaven, and at the same time in the mouth of a communicant on earth.

Nor will it be denied, I suppose, that this Rubric was intended to oppose the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Now the Church of Rome does not mean by *corporal presence* a gross material presence, but precisely that sort of presence which is imagined by the Authors under review, namely, a substantial presence of the body after a supernatural manner in a spiritual and immaterial form. For the Council of Trent admits, that our Saviour, "according to his natural manner of existence," is always seated in Heaven, but maintains that he is present in the Eucharist "sacramentally, in his own substance," in a supernatural way of existence.[1] And this is the doctrine of all the Romish writers of any authority on the

[1] Nec enim hæc inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris in cœlis assideat, juxta modum existendi naturalem; et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter præsens sua substantia nobis adsit, ea existendi ratione, quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo, cogitatione per fidem illustrata, assequi possumus, et constantissime credere debemus. Concil. Trid. Sess. xiii. cap. 1.

subject.[1] "They apprehend," says Bishop Burnet,[2] "that Christ's Body is present after the manner of a Spirit, without extension or the filling of space." But this presence they all maintain to be a *corporal* presence, a real bodily presence, though vouchsafed in a supernatural way.

Thus also the Lutherans, while they of course maintain, that the Body of Christ is received "not in a Capernaite way, but in a supernatural and heavenly manner," [3] yet nevertheless, contending for a presence of that Body like that advocated by the Authors under review, call it, as a matter of course, a *corporal presence*. And, pleading for it, they say, "We find not only that the Roman Church affirms *the corporal presence* of Christ, but that the Greek Church both now holds, and also formerly held, *the same view*."[4]

And this presence the Rubric rejects, on the ground that, our Saviour's body being a natural body, it cannot be really and substantially present in two places at the same time.

Archdeacon Denison has omitted to notice this Rubric. And the explanation of it given by Archdeacon Wilberforce is as follows. Endeavouring to obtain some support for his argument from the fact that the posture of kneeling is retained among us in the reception of the Eucharist, which he tells us "is a fact of great moment, by which the Church of England is allied to the ancient faith," [5] he adds, that "this fact is not neutralized by the somewhat ambiguous Rubric which was affixed to the Communion Office in 1662;" [6] urging that instead of the words "*real* and *essential* presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood," (which were the words of this Rubric in the Prayer-Book of 1552,) were substituted in the revision of 1662 the words "*corporal* presence of Christ's natural flesh and

[1] See for instance,—Bellarm. De Euch. lib. i. c. 2, 3, 5, 10, &c.; Holden. Anal. fid.; Berington and Kirk's, "The Faith of Catholics," 3rd ed. vol. 2. p. 383; Gother's Papist misrepresented and represented; &c.

[2] Burnet's Comment. on XXXIX. Articles, Art. 28.

[3] Non Capernaitice, sed supernaturali et cœlesti modo. Form. Concord. Pt. 1. loc. vii. aff. 6. Libr. Symb. Eccl. Luth. ed. Hase, 1846. p. 600.

[4] Comperimus non tantum Romanam Ecclesiam affirmare corporalem Christi præsentiam, sed idem et nunc sentire, et olim etiam sensisse, Græcam Ecclesiam. Ibid. Pt. 2. loc. vii. ib. p. 728.

[5] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 299; 3rd ed. p. 257. [6] Ib.

blood," and therefore that we are not forbidden now to hold, that "though no adoration be due to the bread and wine, or to any such corporal presence *as the senses can take cognizance of*, yet that Christ's Body and Blood, *really present under the forms of bread and wine, as the inward part or res sacramenti*, are entitled to and receive adoration," and "that *the presence of his Body and Blood is witnessed by the adoration to which they are entitled.*"[1]

Now here, as in other cases, if the Archdeacon, instead of quoting a few words of the Rubric, calculated only to cloud the matter, had told the whole truth, the reader would at once have seen that his inference is unfounded. For the Rubric in another part expressly tells us, *why* the posture of kneeling was retained, namely, "for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all *worthy* receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion as might otherwise ensue." This posture, therefore, is *not* retained as an act of adoration to any supposed real presence of Christ under the elements; for, if this had been the case, it would have been *the special reason why kneeling was requisite.* In fact, to condemn kneeling to the consecrated elements because of a supposed *corporal* presence of Christ in them, and at the same time to advocate kneeling to them on account of a *real* presence of Christ in them, called "supernatural," "essential," and "substantial," is a distinction which, I trust, will ever be left in the hands of those who have invented it.

And as to the alteration of the words "real and essential presence" into "corporal presence," (to which the Archdeacon again refers in his Charge, p. 298) whatever may have been the reason for it, the change will certainly not justify the Archdeacon's views; because the presence he supposes *is* a *corporal* presence; as much a *corporal* presence as that contended for by the Romanists. In *his* view of the phrase "real presence," it is equivalent to "corporal presence."[2]

[1] Ibid. pp. 300, 301; 3rd ed. pp. 258, 259.

[2] The Archdeacon will find this expressly maintained by the Romanists. Thus Woodhead, in speaking of this change in the Rubric, says,—"If we do not take *præsentia corporalis* or *præsentia naturalis* in such a sense as they [that they]

The reason for the change of the words "real and essential" into "corporal," I humbly take to be, that the communicant may properly adore Christ as, in one sense of the words, really and essentially present *in the Lord's Supper*, but not as *corporally* present; and therefore that it was thought better to substitute that word for the other two. It will be observed, that in both Rubrics, the question is as to the presence *in the Lord's Supper*, not specially in or under the elements. The words in the first Rubric were, that no adoration is "done or ought to be done," "either unto the sacramental bread and wine *there* [*i. e.*, "in the administration of the Lord's Supper"] bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence, *there* being, of Christ's natural flesh and blood." Now it might reasonably be thought, that these words, applying to all that took place *in the administration of the Lord's Supper*, went a little too far; as in one meaning of the words "real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood," Christ might be considered as present to the faithful receiver in the administration of the rite, and therefore the word *corporal* was substituted for them.

imply the presence of some *corporal* or *natural* accidents or properties by Divine power separable (as some are, the essence still preserved, and who knows exactly how many: *in which respect Christ's Body is denied, as by the English,* SO BY THE ROMAN AND LUTHERAN CHURCHES, *to be in the Eucharist modo corporeo or naturali*): but take them as they imply the *corporal or natural presence of the essence or substance* of this Body; thus will *real or essential* presence be the same with *corporal* and *natural*." And then he adds, very justly, that "the essential or substantial" presence is denied as much as "the natural," "whenever this reason in both is added for it, viz., because *Idem corpus non potest esse simul in diversis locis;* for this reason seems necessarily to exclude the one as well as the other, the real and essential presence as well as corporal and natural." And therefore he points out that this change in the Rubric cannot justify any in holding the real bodily presence, seeing that the same reason is retained; observing, "Let them express this essential or substantial presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist how they please, by calling it *mystica, spiritualis, symbolica, sacramentalis,* or the like; yet if the presence of the essence or substance be still retained, they are eased no more thus from maintaining that *Idem corpus potest esse in duobus locis* (or *ubi*) *simul,* than any other party which hold any grosser presence there." "In my apprehension either these our English divines must affirm this proposition of *one body at the same time being in more places than one,* or some other equivalent to it, to be true; or must cease to assert any *real, essential,* or *substantial* presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, contradistinct to [what he, like the Archdeacons, is pleased to call] the sense of the Zuinglians." —(Woodhead's Two Discourses concerning the Adoration of our Blessed Saviour in the Holy Eucharist. Oxf. 1687. 4to. pp. 18—20.)

Let us now proceed to notice the passages to which the Authors under consideration refer as supporting their doctrine.

First, Archdeacon Denison's references.

He first adduces the fact, that there is a warning against receiving the sacrament unworthily; and he hesitates not definitely to assign as the reason for this, that there was held to be a "real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist 'under the form of Bread and Wine.'"[1] Such is his first proof! Will the reader expect me to take any further notice of it? I presume not, especially after the proof I have given above,[2] that our Church is not responsible for the phrase here referred to.

He next proceeds to the Rubrics, and he quotes those that order persons who wish to be partakers of the Communion to send their names to the Curate the day before, &c. And he tells us that they imply: "1. That all come to partake of a Holy Thing. "2. That all may partake of that Holy Thing as they ought "not. 3. That the Holy Thing of which they come to partake "is the same in all cases."[3]

No doubt, setting aside an ambiguity in the phraseology of the third point here mentioned, these statements are perfectly true. All come to partake of "a Holy Thing," namely, that which has been set apart and consecrated as sacred symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ; and all may partake of that "Holy Thing" unworthily; and that Holy Thing of which the communicants come to partake orally and outwardly, is the same in all cases. And it is an awful desecration of holy things and sacred mysteries when the wicked partake of them. The wicked and the faithful equally partake of the sacrament, but not of that which the sacrament represents, as Augustine over and over again testifies.

But, so far as concerns spiritual eating and drinking, the wicked and unbelieving do *not* come to partake of the same Thing as believers come to partake of; for the latter come to eat spiritually of the Body and Blood of Christ, of which they are by faith made partakers, while the unbelieving do *not* come for any such purpose.

[1] Serm. 2. p. 91; 3rd ed. p. 60. [2] See pp. 40—48 above.
[3] p. 94; 3rd ed. p. 62.

And yet Archdeacon Denison tells us, that these Rubrics "appear to" him "to be conclusive upon the matter!"

He proceeds to the "Exhortation," and argues at some length, that "it is the same Holy Sacrament which is 'so divine "and comfortable a thing to them who receive it worthily,' "which is 'so dangerous to them that will presume to receive "it unworthily.'"[1] No doubt it is: because both the faithful and the faithless receive the same Holy Sacrament, but it is a divine and comfortable thing only to those who receive it worthily, because, in the language of the same Service elsewhere, God vouchsafes to feed those who *duly receive* these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of his Son Jesus Christ.

But to this the Archdeacon replies, that the word "sacrament" means more here than the outward part or sign, and attempts to prove it, first, because it is called "that Holy Sacrament," as if the elements were not to be considered *holy* after consecration except his doctrine were true; secondly, because it is used to denote the same thing in all cases, so that those who affirm this "cannot maintain it upon their own principles," when in fact what we contend for is, that all *do* receive *the same thing* orally and outwardly, and it is of this outwardly received sacrament that the "Exhortation" is speaking, admonishing us *so* to receive it as that we *may* receive *also* the thing signified by it. And he adds, that, besides the word "sacrament," the words "mystery," "communion," and "table" are all similarly used, and to all the word "holy" is prefixed, which he thinks is another conclusive proof of his doctrine. Of this I leave the reader to judge.

He admits that in the Catechism the word "sacrament" is used to express "the outward part or sign," but he says,— "What I contend for is, that the word 'sacramentum' or "'sacrament,' when used apart from the above distinction,— "[i.e. the distinction between the "sacramentum," the "res "sacramenti," and the "virtus sacramenti,"] and *à fortiori* the "words 'Holy Sacrament'—is neither in this, nor in any other "place, either in the Catechism or elsewhere, used by the Church "to denote 'the outward part or sign' only."[2] But I must

[1] p. 98; 3rd ed. p. 66. [2] p. 101; 3rd ed. p. 67.

remind the Archdeacon, that it is not what he "*contends for*," but what he *proves*, that will alone benefit his cause. The constrained admission of the Archdeacon, that the Catechism does in one place speak of the word "sacrament" as denoting "the outward part or sign only," is fatal to his cause, because the word is not applicable at all to the bread and wine until they are consecrated; and, therefore, as the term sacrament, when used of the elements, must refer to the *consecrated* elements, and yet the term, when used in the Catechism with reference to the elements, is (by the Archdeacon's admission) said there to denote "the outward part or sign only," it follows, that the consecrated elements are the outward part or sign only. The Catechism distinctly says, that by the word "sacrament" is meant "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace," and that the outward and visible sign in the Lord's Supper is "bread and wine." But they are not so until they are consecrated, and set apart as the sacrament. And in the other parts of the Catechism, where the word "sacrament" is used, it is used, not with reference to *the elements*, but to *the whole rite*; as when it says, that there are two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and that there are two parts in a sacrament, "the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace." In the former case the difference in the usage of the word is manifest; in the latter it is equally undeniable, because the word had been before defined as meaning "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." And this use of the word in a twofold sense is common to all treatises on the subject.[1]

And it is evident that the Catechism follows this double use of the word, and that, according to it, when the word is used of *the thing received*, it denotes the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace; and when it is used of *the rite* it means a rite in which there are two parts, "the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace." And that these two parts *properly belong* to the rite, no one denies; but it does not follow, that if men come unworthily to it, the grace is given by God. If it were so, it would follow, that adults coming in vice and hypocrisy to baptism, necessarily receive the "inward and spiritual grace" of baptism, namely, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," and are made "the children of

[1] See Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner, Pref. Works, P. S. ed. Pt. i., p. 3. The passage will be found below, chap vii. § 2, under "Cranmer."

grace." And to this awful assertion has the Archdeacon been driven in order to uphold his doctrine of the sacraments.[1]

But before I quit the Archdeacon's remarks upon this "Exhortation," I must point the reader's attention to another illustration of his mode of dealing with these matters. The "Exhortation," it will be remembered, is addressed to the "religiously and devoutly disposed," stating that the sacrament is "to be *by them* received in remembrance of Christ's meritorious death and passion;" and with reference to *them* it is stated, that God has given his Son "to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy sacrament." The Archdeacon, omitting all notice of the fact that the parties spoken of are the "religiously and devoutly disposed," says that the Exhortation declares that the Sacrament "is to be received *by Christ's people* 'in remembrance of his meritorious cross and passion;'" and then having identified "Christ's people" with "all the baptized," infers that the doctrine of this Exhortation is, that Christ "gives himself for the food of all the baptized," and that "for all the baptized is provided in the Holy Communion the gift of his Body and Blood, to be their 'spiritual food and sustenance,' and all who come to the Lord's Table receive his Body and his Blood."[2] This needs no comment.

The objection more than once urged by Archdeacon Denison, that because a sacrament is said to consist of two parts, therefore if a person does not receive both parts he does not receive a sacrament, is such a manifest verbal quibble, that I can hardly conceive any one to be deceived by it. The opportunity of getting it is obtained by that double use of the word, which the Archdeacon does not seem to have yet recognized. As our Catechism tells us, *the thing received* as *the sacrament* is the outward and visible sign; and therefore, whenever that outward and visible sign, set apart as the sacramental representative of the Body and Blood of Christ, has been received, the sacrament has been received. And when men are said to receive "the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" (as in the "Exhortation," in which notice is given of the ministration of the Lord's Supper,) it is evident that what is spoken of is *the thing received*. And from the use of these words we obtain another argument against Archdeacon Denison's view;

[1] See Adv. to Serm. 2. p. 66 *note*; 3rd ed. p. 43; and Serm. 2. pp, 126, 127; 3rd ed. p. 86.

[2] Serm. 2. pp. 97, 98; 3rd ed. pp. 65, 66.

for if the word "sacrament" meant in this place what he declares it to mean, there would be the most absurd tautology, for they would be equivalent to the words,—*the bread and body of Christ, and the wine and blood of Christ, of the Body and Blood of Christ.*

Archdeacon Denison has ventured here, in his Notes, to refer to Jewel, Cranmer, and Nowel. That he can have read either of them is utterly irreconcilable with such a reference; and painful it is to see any one in his position so utterly ignorant of the views of these Fathers of our Reformed Church, who have so learnedly and largely entered upon the topics discussed by the Archdeacon in his Sermons, and utterly refuted and overthrown the doctrine he is attempting to establish as the doctrine of our Church. But I add no more respecting them here, as I shall hereafter give a full account of their statements on the subject.

The Archdeacon proceeds to the "Exhortation," used "at the time of the celebration of the Communion," and still more clearly shows his misapprehension of the whole matter, and his total ignorance of the views of those to whom we are indebted for our Formularies, as clearly and frequently expressed in their works. He tells us, that "it *assumes* that the Bread and "the Cup of which these [i. e. unworthy receivers] may 'pre-"sume to eat and drink'—the Holy Sacrament which these "may receive unworthily—are *the same* with that Bread and "that Cup of which those eat and drink who eat and drink "worthily."[1] No doubt they are. The Bread and Wine, that is, all that is outwardly and orally received, are just the same things in all cases, whether received by the faithful or the faithless. All receive the same sacrament, but not that which it signifies and symbolizes.

And now comes a passage, showing that the Archdeacon is utterly unconscious of the nature of the controversy into which he has thrown himself, utterly unconscious of the doctrine formally and laboriously maintained against the Romanists by (to mention no others) Cranmer, Ridley, and Jewel. He says,—"In what respect *the same?* Is it meant that in both "cases that Bread and that Cup—that Holy Sacrament—are "simply Bread and Wine after consecration, as before? No—

[1] Serm. 2. pp. 103, 104; 3rd ed. p. 69.

" it is confessed that this cannot be what is meant—it is con-
" fessed upon all hands, that to those receiving worthily they
" are certainly not simply Bread and Wine after consecration
" as before: that, after consecration, they are *to these* the Body
" and the Blood of Christ."[1] Nothing of the kind. No such confession would be thought of (that is, *in the sense in which the Archdeacon uses the words*[2]) by those who hold the doctrine of Cranmer, Ridley, and Jewel. The consecrated elements are *in themselves* simply Bread and Wine, as they were before consecration. The only change that has taken place respecting them is, that they are now set apart and made sacred as the signs and symbols of the most holy Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore, as so consecrated according to the Divine precept, are *holy things*, of which he who partakes unworthily is guilty of doing dishonour to the Body and Blood of Christ, which they *represent;* and of which he who partakes worthily is, through their instrumentality, brought into communion with the Body and Blood of Christ. Their *character* and *purpose* and *effect* are greatly changed, and therefore *in that sense* they are not simply Bread and Wine; just as colours which have been formed into a picture representing the Sovereign, though they remain in themselves nothing more than they were before, are not simply so much paint, but the representation of the Sovereign, *which representation he who insults and injures is guilty of insult and injury to the Person whom it represents.*

And I would beg the reader to observe, that in this passage the Archdeacon has (apparently unwittingly) gone back to a phrase used in the first Prayer-Book of 1549, and deliberately struck out in the first revision in 1552, on account of its being likely to lead to unsound views, and *ever since excluded,* and uses it as if it represented the views of *all,* and was admitted even by those against whom he was writing. He says that it is

[1] Serm. 2. p. 104; 3rd ed. p. 69.

[2] Everything depends upon the sense in which these words are used. There is, no doubt, a sense in which it might be said, that the consecrated elements are to faithful recipients the body and blood of Christ, as Cranmer has pointed out in a passage quoted pp. 462, 463 above. But that is not the sense in which Archdeacon Denison here uses the words. And on account of their being *open* to the sense affixed to them by the Archdeacon, they were struck out of the Prayer-Book.

confessed by all, that, after consecration, the Bread and Wine "are *to these* [i. e. worthy recipients] the Body and the Blood of Christ." Now it so happens that this was the very phraseology used in the first Prayer-Book of 1549, and afterwards struck out as objectionable. In the Book of 1549 the prayer was used,—"Sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that *they may be unto us* the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." To these words Bucer, when called upon by Archbishop Cranmer to send him his opinion of the Prayer-Book to help him in its revision, took particular exception, as being likely to appear to favor the Romish doctrine of a change in the Bread and Wine, and earnestly recommended an alteration to be made in them; and accordingly in the revised Prayer-Book, published in 1552, *they were altered to those very words which I have quoted above from our present Service, as referred to by Dr. Brett as indisputably proving that our Church does* NOT *hold that the Bread and Wine become in any sense the Body and Blood of Christ.*

The difference between the faithful and the faithless, in the Lord's Supper, is not in that which is received into the mouth, but in that which is received spiritually and by the soul through faith.

The Archdeacon next refers to the words, "so shall ye be *meet* partakers of those HOLY MYSTERIES;" and he argues at some length, that therefore it is supposed there may be some *unmeet* partakers. He has given himself needless trouble, for I suppose no one would dream of denying it. The question is, what the "mysteries" here spoken of are, and of course they are the consecrated bread and wine on the Table; and the Archdeacon must prove that they are what he maintains them to be, before the fact that there are unmeet partakers of them can prove anything in his favor. And if he will turn to p. 272 above, he will find the Author of the Commentary on Matthew attributed to Chrysostom, saying of the vessels used for the administration of the Eucharist,—"in which there is *not the true body* of Christ, but the *mystery* of his body is contained." His argument, therefore, is again a mere *petitio principii.*

The last passage in this Service to which the Archdeacon refers is the following,—"Grant us therefore, gracious Lord,

" so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink " his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his " body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, " and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us."

The Archdeacon's argument is briefly this, that as the prayer is, that we may *so* eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, that these blessings may be obtained by us, it must have been supposed, that we might eat and drink them without obtaining those blessings. Be it so. But nevertheless it does not follow, that his doctrine was held by those who so worded the prayer. For it is merely a supplication, that we may *so* feed on the Body and Blood of Christ, that we may derive *the full benefit* which that Body and Blood, received by a lively faith, can afford to fallen man; which is a most reasonable and proper prayer, and one which does not involve the Archdeacon's doctrine. And when we compare, as we are bound to do, the statement of the 28th Article, that "*the mean* whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *faith*," there can be no doubt as to the meaning we are necessarily called upon to give to the words of this prayer.

If the words had been,—"so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood *in these elements*—or, *in this bread and wine*, or, something similar—there might have been some force in the Archdeacon's arguments; and it is one of those significant alterations from the Liturgy of 1549, to which I have already called the attention of the reader, that in that Liturgy there *did* occur in this place these very words—"in these holy mysteries,"—and that in the revision of 1552 (in which everything implying a real presence in the elements was altered or omitted) these words were *struck out*, and they *remain excluded* in all subsequent revisions.

These arguments are followed by the *assertion* (it is nothing more), that "the act of consecration makes the real presence," and he then apostrophizes his brethren in a few paragraphs, beginning thus,—"Oh Priests of the Church of God, to us " it is given to be the channels and the agents, whereby " the Holy Ghost doth thus make the Body and the Blood of " Christ to be really, though invisibly and supernaturally, " present under the form of Bread and Wine in the Lord's

"Supper—to us it is given to 'give' His Body and His "Blood unto His People."[1]

On the painful character of this, and the language that follows it, I make no remark. But for my own part I leave it to the Archdeacon to glory in the power to "give" what I humbly look to God alone to give, and would remind him of the reverential words with which another part of the Service he has been quoting ascribes the praise to God for such a gift:— "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee "for that THOU dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have *duly* "received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the "most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus "Christ."

Secondly, let us examine the references made to this formulary by Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey.

The only passage in the Communion Service to which I find Dr. Pusey[2] and Archdeacon Wilberforce[3] referring in support of their views, is the prayer that we may "so eat the flesh of thy dear Son," &c., the meaning of which we have just been considering.[4]

Archdeacon Wilberforce, indeed, appears clearly to admit, in one place, that the language of the Prayer-Book is opposed to his views. For, when speaking of the revision of the first Prayer-Book of Edw. VI. in 1552, he says,—"But about a "year after the publication of King Edward's First Book, "Archbishop Cranmer *abandoned his belief in the Real Presence* "—a change which seems to have been very acceptable to the "young King and his favourites. By virtue of the more than "Papal power which he assumed, Edward soon superseded the "Book which he had formerly sanctioned, and imposed his "Second Book of 1552 upon the nation. *By this means, as*

[1] Sermon 2. pp. 107, 108; 3rd ed. p. 72. [2] Serm. p. 33. [3] Charge, p. 291.

[4] I ought perhaps to mention here, that Archdeacon Wilberforce, in his "Charge" (pp. 290, 291,) seems disposed to raise a sort of argument in his favor from the fact, that it is directed by our Church, that, if the bread and wine first consecrated be exhausted before all the communicants are supplied, the words of consecration "are ordered to be repeated," and also that a priest only is allowed to pronounce the words of consecration. But I must say that when, out of fairness to the Archdeacon, I have mentioned this, I have done all that I think any reader who has any regard for the value of time will require.

" *well as by the forty-two Articles which were published the same* " *year,* and in like manner, without any spiritual sanction, THE " ZUINGLO-CALVINISTIC SYSTEM TOOK POSSESSION OF OUR " CHURCHES." "The Service was divested of its sacrificial " character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times, to " the great event which is transacted at the altar. *This was* " *done, both by mutilating the prayer of oblation, which had been* " *retained in the Book of* 1548, *and by placing it after, instead of* " *before, the Communion.*"[1]

Such is the description which Archdeacon Wilberforce himself gives of the state of Cranmer's mind when the Prayer-Book and Articles of 1552 were put forth, and of their character and effect, and of what he calls the "mutilation" of the Communion Service in the Prayer-Book of 1552. He admits that they entirely condemn his doctrine of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Now first as to the doctrine of the Real Presence, will the Archdeacon contend, that it is less condemned by our Formularies as they now stand? Certainly he has not attempted to do so in the work now under consideration, though it might be supposed, that one of the points to which an Archdeacon of our Church would direct his special attention in writing an elaborate work on the Eucharist, would be to prove that his doctrine was consistent with that maintained in the Formularies he had subscribed. With respect to his doctrine of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, it of course falls with the doctrine of the Real Presence. But on that point he is clearly *self-condemned* by his own words. For the "mutilation" by which he complains that "the Service was divested of its sacrificial character," confessedly remains in that Service to the present day. And thus that sacrifice of Christ's flesh and blood in the Eucharist which he maintains to be a vital and essential part of divine worship is, by his own confession, not to be found in the Church of England.[2]

[1] WILB. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 438—440; 3rd ed. pp. 378—380.

[2] Whether therefore it follows, or not, from the words of our present Service, that non-communicants may remain in the Church during the celebration of the Communion, (out of which the Archdeacon would fain build an argument in his favor, p. 441), is a point of no moment, so far as concerns its being any evidence that the Church of England favors Archdeacon Wilberforce's views. And it is

Nor should I omit to notice, that, when speaking on this subject, he commences with the broad and distinct avowal, that our Church is in error in a point of "vital importance" connected with this matter, namely, in not practising the *daily* ministration of the Holy Eucharist.[1] He says, that it is "an "instance of discrepancy [from the Primitive Church] which, "according to primitive rules, *admits of no justification*, since it "is at variance in a most grave and momentous particular, not "only with the universal judgment of the ancient Church, but "also with the acknowledged practice of the Holy Apostles."[2]

SECTION II.

Testimony of the Homilies.

The second Formulary to which I shall refer, is the Book of Homilies.

The Second Book of Homilies contains one expressly written on the subject before us, entitled,—"Of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

Archdeacon Denison says, that "the title itself shows that "there is in the mind of the Church an unworthy receiving of "the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, as there is a "worthy receiving of it: a worthy and an unworthy receiving of "the same thing."[3] Such, no doubt, is the case. Both the wicked and the faithful partake of that "outward and visible sign" that has been set apart and consecrated to be "the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." And the words themselves may show the Archdeacon, that the word "sacrament" here does *not* mean the outward and the inward part together; for, as I have already observed, these words would then be equivalent to—the bread and body of Christ and the wine and blood of Christ of the Body and Blood of Christ.

And now, before we proceed to consider the passages from this Homily adduced by Archdeacon Denison, it will be well for the

perfectly clear that they are not supposed to derive any benefit from so doing, which alone is sufficient to negative the Archdeacon's notion as to the object for which some words in the Exhortation were altered.

[1] Ibid. pp. 428 et seq.; 3rd ed. pp. 369 et seq.

[2] Ibid. p. 429; 3rd ed. pp. 369, 370. [3] Serm. 2. p. 109; 3rd ed. p. 73.

reader to see the clear and definite statements which this Homily contains condemnatory of his doctrine.

At the close of the First Part we read as follows :—

"It is well known that the meat we seek for in this Supper is spiritual food; the nourishment of our soul; a heavenly refection, and not earthly; an invisible meat, and not bodily; a ghostly substance, and not carnal; *so that to think that without faith we may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof*, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream *a gross carnal feeding*, basely objecting and binding ourselves to the elements and creatures. Whereas, by the advice of the Council of Nicene, we ought to lift up our minds by faith, and, leaving these inferior and earthly things, THERE seek it, *where the Sun of righteousness ever shineth.* Take then this lesson, O thou that art desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend Communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, 'thou *look up with faith* upon the holy Body and Blood of thy God, thou marvel with reverence, thou *touch it with the* MIND, thou *receive it with the hand of thy* HEART, and thou take it fully with *thy inward man.*'" [1]

And the same application of these passages from the Council of Nice and Emissenus is made both by Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Jewel; namely, as showing us, that we must look beyond what we see upon the holy table, and by faith partake spiritually of the body and blood of Christ as present in heaven.

And the *immediate* context following this passage is this,—

"Thus we see, beloved, that, resorting to this table, we must pluck up all the roots of infidelity, all distrust in God's promises, that we make ourselves living members of Christ's Body. FOR THE UNBELIEVERS AND FAITHLESS CANNOT FEED UPON THAT PRECIOUS BODY. Whereas the faithful have their life, their abiding in him, their union, and as it were their incorporation with him. Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves, unfeignedly, without flattering ourselves, whether we be plants of that fruitful olive, living branches of the true Vine, members indeed of Christ's mystical Body, whether God hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of his gospel, and embracing of his mercies in Christ Jesu, SO THAT at this his table we receive not *only the outward sacrament*, but *the spiritual thing also;* not the figure, but the truth; not *the shadow only*, but the Body; not to death, but to life; not to destruction, but to salvation; which God grant us to do," &c. [2]

[1] Homilies, ed. Corrie, p. 449. [2] Ibid. pp. 449, 450.

Words more thoroughly eversive of Archdeacon Denison's doctrine could not be conceived.

We are told in the first passage, in what way only we can eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, by *faith*, and with the *mind* and *heart*; and in the second, that "*the unbelievers and faithless cannot feed upon that precious Body*," and that those who come without right dispositions receive "only the OUTWARD SACRAMENT," and *not* "the spiritual thing," "the *figure*" and *not* "the truth," "the *shadow* ONLY," and *not* "the Body."

And the reader must also not fail to remark, how the use here made of the word "sacrament" negatives the assertion made by the Archdeacon as to the meaning intended by that word in our Formularies.

Now, will it be believed, that the Archdeacon quotes the above extract from Emissenus (which is directly opposed to his views, and is quoted by Cranmer, Jewel, and others of our Reformers in opposition to the notion of a real presence in the elements) as supporting his views, with the prefatory remark,—"What that is which is present in the Holy Communion the Homily declares as follows." And he then proceeds to explain away the directly adverse testimony that "the unbelievers and faithless cannot feed upon that precious Body," by asserting that it means that they *may* "feed" upon it, "but not worthily," so as to have "their life, their abiding in Christ," &c., in direct opposition to the words, and also to the testimony not only of the whole Homily but of the Article, that "*the mean* whereby the Body of Christ is eaten is *faith*."

And of the equally plain testimony against him, that the faithless receive "only the outward sacrament" and *not* "the spiritual thing also," "the figure" and *not* "the truth," "the shadow only" and *not* "the Body," he takes not the slightest notice!!

In the presence of this direct testimony, it would be a waste of time to dwell upon such passages as those adduced by the Archdeacon from the second part of the Homily, which bring not the shadow of an argument in his favor. As to St. Basil's words about coming to the Body and Blood of Christ, the citation of such a passage merely shows a want of acquaintance with the fact (already so frequently pointed out), that the signs are

called by the Fathers by the names of the things signified by them. And when he quotes the words, "let us take heed we come not with our sins unexamined into this presence of our Lord and Judge," does he suppose that his opponents hold that our Lord is absent from his house of prayer, and his own holy Supper? Can our Lord's presence be vouchsafed only by his body and blood being joined to bread and wine?

And this last passage leads me to notice another extract which the Archdeacon has given in another place[1] from this Homily as supporting his doctrine:—"Thus much must we be sure to "hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, "no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent." Doubtless we ought to hold this; because we have there the *true figure* of *a thing present*. For the Bread and Wine constitute a true figure of the Body and Blood of Christ, which are in a spiritual manner present to the souls of the faithful communicants; as the sun is present to those who enjoy its light and heat. The Archdeacon has forgotten, that the question at issue relates to the *mode of presence* by which the communion of the body and blood of Christ is vouchsafed to the communicants. And this is not determined by the words he has quoted from the homily. But, as in other cases, this question *is* determined in the context of the passage he has quoted. For after the words, "no untrue figure of a thing absent," the sentence proceeds thus—"but, as "the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup "of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his "death, yea, *the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, in* "*a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy* "*Ghost—the very bond of our conjunction with Christ—is* "THROUGH FAITH *wrought in the souls of the faithful*, whereby "not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust "to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality."[2]

The reference made by Archdeacon Denison to the "Advertisement" at the end of the First Book of Homilies, I have already noticed in a former chapter.[3]

To the Book of Homilies Dr. Pusey[4] and Archdeacon Wil-

[1] Serm. 2. p. 80; 3rd ed. p. 53. [2] Book of Homilies, ed. Corrie, pp. 446, 447.

[3] See pp. 40—48 above.

[4] A passage is indeed quoted by Dr. Pusey (Serm. p. 73.) from the Homily on the Sacraments, but not apparently in an argumentative way as evidence in favor of the doctrine here objected to.

berforce make no reference; with the single exception of the "Advertisement" just alluded to, which in fact, as I have already shown,[1] forms no part of it, and for which our Church is not responsible.

SECTION III.

Testimony of the XXXIX. Articles.

The third and most important Formulary to be considered is, —The XXXIX Articles.

By Archdeacon Wilberforce no attempt is made to show the consistency of his doctrine with that of the Articles. Indeed his only allusions to them in his work on the Eucharist, are, *first*, his attempt[2] to explain away the meaning of the word *substance* in Art. XXVIII (which I have already fully noticed, page 24—26 above); and *secondly*, an incidental remark[3] as to the omission of certain words from Art. XXVIII, as finally agreed upon in 1562, which had been inserted in the corresponding Article of 1552; a circumstance which I shall hereafter notice.

To these he has added in his "Charge"[4] the following notice of the 29th Article, which I give entire, as I think it well that the reader should be made acquainted with the mode in which the Formularies of our Church are dealt with by this Author. It stands thus,—

"Again, the quotation from St. Augustine in our 29th Article, is often referred to, as though designed to negative the idea of our Lord's Actual Presence. But not only is this quotation employed by the Church of Rome in the Service for Corpus Christi Day; but its most material words are not really St. Augustine's, they were added at a later period, probably by Bede, by whom our Lord's actual Presence in this sacrament cannot possibly have been doubted."

Thus is the reader led away from the plain statement of our 29th Article, directly negativing the Archdeacon's doctrine, (of which no notice is taken) by remarks upon a passage of Augustine quoted in it, which, whether true or false, leave the Archdeacon's doctrine equally condemned by the Article. The

[1] See pp. 40—48 above.
[2] pp. 127 et seq.; 3rd ed. p. 108 et seq.
[3] p. 300; 3rd ed. p. 258.
[4] pp. 281, 282.

truth of those remarks, and the meaning of the Article, I shall consider presently.

But, in fact, the anxiety of the Archdeacon to keep the XXXIX Articles out of sight is very apparent, and is somewhat curiously illustrated in the "Charge." He tells us that,—"The XXXIX Articles were not agreed upon in the Northern "as they were in the Southern Convocation: their authority here "dates from the year 1605, when subscription to them was en-"joined by the 36th Canon;" and from this statement he deduces the following argument, that as "our 57th Canon tells "us, that the doctrine both of Baptism and the Lord's Supper "is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer, "to be used at the administration of the said Sacraments, as "nothing can be added unto it that is material and necessary," therefore, "the same authority by which the Articles were "adopted refers us to the Ordinal as a doctrinal explanation of "the Sacraments."[1] The argument is, no doubt, very ingeniously constructed for the purpose of leading us away from the definite statements of the Articles to the necessarily more ambiguous formulary in the Prayer-Book; but I doubt whether it will have any other practical effect than that of showing us the disposition of the Archdeacon towards the Articles.

As to the remark that the authority of the Articles in the Northern Province "dates from the year 1605," it is altogether a mistake. For, in the first place, the Articles were put forth, after the Convocation of 1562, under the express authority of the Bishops of the Northern as well as the Southern Province, as the subscription to them testifies,[2] and the actual signatures of the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham and Chester. And the ratificatory clause is signed by *the Bishops only* of *either* Province, the clergy signing merely in signification of their adhesion to the Articles so drawn up. And the Canon of 1571 respecting Preachers, so often cited and relied upon by the Archdeacon and his party, speaks of them as *agreed upon by the Bishops*. And therefore our best authorities of former times, as

[1] Wilb. Charge, pp. 288, 289.

[2] Hos articulos &c. nos archiepiscopi et episcopi utriusque Provinciæ regni Angliæ &c. recipimus et profitemur, et ut veros atque orthodoxos manuum nostrarum subscriptionibus approbamus &c.

for instance Archbishop Wake,[1] have considered the Articles as having been put forth by sufficient ecclesiastical authority in the Northern Province.

And, secondly, were it not so, the Act of Parliament of 1571, entitled "An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound religion," which was directed principally against Romanizing ministers, requires subscription to the Articles, and expressly enacts the penalty of *deprivation* against those ministers who shall "advisedly maintain or affirm any doctrine directly contrary or repugnant to any of the said Articles."

Dr. Pusey passes over the Articles in profound silence; except that, when noticing their rejection of Transubstantiation, he adds the vague and general *assertion,* that "they except against no "statement which does not imply that the natural substances "cease to be."[2]

But Archdeacon Denison, with characteristic boldness, but not perhaps quite as much astuteness, fearlessly takes in hand the task of reconciling his doctrine with their testimony, and has certainly raised a cloud of dust through which some readers may have a difficulty in seeing their way. But let me apprize them at the outset, that almost all the obscurity in which he has contrived to envelop the plain testimony of the Articles, arises from *two false assumptions* which form the groundwork of his whole argumentation; and if the reader will bear this in mind, he will find no difficulty in seeing his way through all the difficulties raised by the Archdeacon. They are, *first,* his *assumption,* that whenever the word "sacrament" is used, it means the *outward sign and the thing signified joined together;* and *secondly,* that by consecration the thing signified is joined to the outward sign; so that the sacrament being once made by consecration, if any communicant is supposed not to receive the thing signified as well as the outward sign, the sacrament must be held to be (to use the Archdeacon's own phrase) *unmade* in the case of such persons at the moment of receiving—a supposition which is no doubt sufficiently absurd.

Now we have already considered at some length in what sense the word Sacrament is used, and therefore I hope the reader is

[1] Wake's State of the Church, pp. 376 and 604.
[2] Pusey's Serm. pp. 14, 15.

already prepared utterly to deny the *first* of these assumptions; and the *second* falls with it, for as the water, bread, and wine are made sacraments by consecration, and these sacraments are, according to the definition of the Catechism, outward signs of grace, it is clear that consecration does nothing more than make these things, which were before only water bread and wine, holy symbols and representatives of most sacred things, and that all the Archdeacon's magniloquent descriptions of "the consecrating power," as something which enables "the priest" to cause the Body and Blood of Christ to be joined to the Bread and Wine, so that all who eat and drink the consecrated elements do in that act eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, are only flights of imagination bordering upon impiety.

And with these two false assumptions the whole of the Archdeacon's reasoning upon the Articles falls to the ground. But we must, of course, follow him into the details of his argumentation.

The Articles which the Archdeacon attempts to meet are the 25th, the 28th, and the 29th, and no doubt these are the Articles by which the doctrine of our Church on this subject must be determined. For the convenience of the reader, I shall first give them entire, together with a portion of the 26th, adding a few remarks on them, and then proceed to the Archdeacon's exposition of them.

"Art. XXV. Of the Sacraments. Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

"There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

"Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

"The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in

such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith."

The XXVIth is entitled, "Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament," and in connexion with the subject we are discussing it says,—

"Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men."

"Art. XXVIII. Of the Lord's Supper. The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

"Art. XXIX. Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.

"The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith), the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."

Now, without entering fully into all the particular points of doctrine which these Articles comprehend, there are some important points, obvious to the most superficial reader, which directly affect the teaching of Archdeacon Denison.

One is, the use here made of the word "sacrament." The word "sacrament" or "sacraments" is evidently used in these Articles, as in the Catechism and every Treatise on the subject,

in two different senses; namely, sometimes as signifying *the rite as a whole*,—as, where it is said, that there are two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the L rd,—and in other places as signifying *the consecrated elements*, as, where it is said, that "the sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon," &c.; that "transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a sacrament;" and that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped," and that the wicked are not partakers of Christ, but rather "do eat and drink *the sign or sacrament* of so great a thing." And if we come to consider the nature of the expressions used respecting the sacrament in this latter sense of the word, we shall find at once that they cannot consist with any other idea of the sacrament than of its being *the outward sign only*. Thus, for instance, it is said, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not to be worshipped. But if, as the Archdeacon contends, the sacrament consists partly of the Body and Blood of Christ, then, (as indeed he expressly maintains,) "worship *is* due" to *that part* of the sacrament, and consequently the language of the Article is most improper. Again, when it is said that the wicked are not partakers of Christ, but rather "do eat and drink the SIGN OR SACRAMENT of so great a thing," can it be doubted for a moment, what the word sacrament means there, namely, that it is equivalent to the word "sign"? How the Archdeacon manages, in his *careful* examination of the Articles, to avoid the condemnation of his doctrine clearly arising from this passage, we shall see hereafter.

Another point, apparent on the surface, is, *how and by whom alone* the Body and Blood of Christ are received. "The Body of Christ," we are told, "is given, taken, and *eaten*, in the Supper, *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner." It is *given only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*. It certainly, therefore, is not given by the hand of the officiating minister, but by God himself, according as in the latter part of the Service we thank Him for it in the words,—"for that Thou dost vouchsafe "to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries with "the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy "Son," &c.[1] And it is *taken and eaten only after a heavenly*

[1] It is therefore with no small astonishment that I read, in the Bishop of

and spiritual manner, and therefore it certainly is not taken into the fingers and eaten with the mouth, as the Archdeacon maintains. "And *the mean* whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *faith*." Now, if there is any meaning in words, it follows from this, that where there is no faith, there the Body of Christ cannot be received and eaten, for "the mean" by which it is received and eaten is wanting.

Any one who has even the slightest acquaintance with the Sacramentarian controversy, knows that this statement involves the very touchstone of the school of doctrine to which a man belongs. For the great question which has always divided the two main schools of doctrine in this matter—that is, those who have held a substantial presence of the Body of Christ in, or with, or under the form of, the elements, and those who have denied it—has been, whether the mean whereby the Body of Christ is *received* and *eaten* in the Supper is *faith only* or *the mouth*. The former have held it to be *the mouth*, considering *faith* to be only necessary for securing certain *benefits* from the reception, not for *the reception itself*: the latter, with the Article, have held it to be *faith*.

And this is forcibly illustrated by the language of the Lutheran "Formula Concordiæ," agreed upon and promulged in 1577 by the stricter portion of the Lutheran Churches for the purpose of pointing out the difference between the genuine Lutheran doctrine and that which they complain had crept into some of their Churches.

In the Article on the Lord's Supper they thus state their belief,—

"We believe, teach and confess, that the body and blood of Christ are taken with the bread and wine, NOT *only after a spiritual manner, by faith*, but also by the mouth; yet not in a Capernaitical manner, but in a supernatural and heavenly manner, by means of the sacramental union." [1]

Exeter's late Pastoral Letter to his Clergy (note, p. 55) the following statement with reference to this controversy,—"Both parties are agreed, that the Body and Blood of Christ are in the Sacrament given to all—that is declared in our 28th Article in terms too express to admit of being disputed." Will the Bishop allow me to ask him, how it is that that is given to *all*, which is given "only after a heavenly and spiritual manner," and which can only be received by *faith*? *Man* can give only in an *earthly* and *sensible* manner.

[1] Credimus docemus et confitemur, corpus et sanguinem Christi non tantum

And they proceed formally to *condemn* the doctrine,—

"That the Body of Christ is not taken in the Holy Supper by the mouth together with the bread, but that the bread and wine only are received by the mouth, and that the Body of Christ is taken *after a spiritual manner only, namely by faith.*" [1]

The very words used in the 28th Article are here formally condemned, as opposed to the doctrine of those who maintained an oral eating of the Body of Christ in the Supper; for which, as common to all the communicants, the Authors of the *Formula Concordiæ* earnestly contended.

And in the Second Part of this *Formula*, where the various points treated of are more largely discussed, it is constantly urged, that the great point to be insisted on *in opposition* to those who stated that the Body of Christ was received only after a spiritual manner in the Lord's Supper, was, that it was received and eaten by *the mouth*.

It says, that,—"They [i.e. those against whom it is written] "think that the flesh and blood of Christ are only in heaven, and "are nowhere else besides, and therefore that Christ gives us his "true body and true blood with the bread and wine to be eaten "and drunk spiritually by faith, but not to be taken corporally "by the mouth;" [2] but that the true doctrine is, that "there is "a twofold manducation of the flesh of Christ. One *spiritual*, "of which principally Christ treats in John vi. . . . . the other "*sacramental*, and takes place by the mouth [ore fit], when in "the Holy Supper the true and substantial Body and Blood "of Christ are received by the mouth and partaken of by all "who eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine in the "Lord's Supper." [3]

The phraseology of the Article is precisely that adopted by those who in the sixteenth century denied the doctrine of such

spiritualiter per fidem, sed etiam ore, non tamen Capernaitice, sed supernaturali et cœlesti modo, ratione sacramentalis unionis, cum pane et vino sumi. Form. Concord. P. 1. Epit. loc. vii. *affirm.* 6. Apud Libr. Symbol. Eccl. Luth. ed. Hase, 1846. p. 600.

[1] Corpus Christi in Sacra Cœna non ore una cum pane sumi: sed tantum panem et vinum ore accipi: corpus vero Christi spiritualiter duntaxat, fide nimirum, sumi. Ibid. *negat.* 5. ib. p. 602.

[2] Christum nobis cum pane et vino verum corpus et verum sanguinem manducandum et bibendum dare spiritualiter per fidem, sed non corporaliter ore sumendum.

[3] Form. Concord. P. 2. loc. vii. ibid. pp. 727; 743, 744.

a presence of Christ's Body and Blood as that contended for by the Authors under review, and precisely that which is expressly and formally condemned as erroneous by those who then held that doctrine. And the testimony just adduced to this fact might easily be multiplied a hundredfold.

How the Archdeacon endeavours to get over this difficulty, we shall see presently.

Before I pass on, it may be well to notice a fact in relation to this Article, which as I have already observed (p. 641 above), Archdeacon Wilberforce refers to as in his favor. The words, "The Body of Christ is given," &c., down to the word "faith," were first inserted by Archbishop Parker in 1562, *in the place of* the following paragraph of the Article of 1552:—

"Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in one certain place, therefore the Body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places: and because as Holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly confess the Real and Bodily Presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

Now the precise reason for this change is not known, and all with which we are necessarily concerned is the true meaning of the words substituted for this paragraph. And those words clearly exclude the notion of the Body of Christ being in or with or under the bread so as to be swallowed by the mouth; because not merely do they affirm, that the Body is given, taken and eaten "ONLY after a heavenly and spiritual manner," but expressly state, that "THE MEAN whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is FAITH." And this is all with which we are here concerned.

But the paragraph which was in the Article of 1552, goes beyond this, and affirms that the Body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places, and therefore not in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that is, not present in the rite.

Now there might be reasons why at that time it was thought inexpedient to compel all to sign this declaration. Among

those who entirely repudiated the doctrines of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, and all notions of the Body and Blood of Christ being connected with the elements by consecration, there was a difference of view, or at least of statement, as to the precise mode of Christ's presence in the rite. The language held by some of them seemed to imply, that there was a real *substantial* presence of Christ's Body and Blood *in the rite* to the *faithful* communicant—a harmless though incorrect notion. It might, therefore, have been considered desirable at that time not to require subscription to such a statement as that contained in the paragraph of the Article of 1552, but to substitute for it words that guarded the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in all essential points.

So far as we are now concerned at the present day, this alteration in the Article does not affect us; because, in the Rubric restored (as already mentioned) to the Prayer-Book, at its last revision in 1562, from the Second Prayer-Book of Edw. VI., published in 1552, the declaration of doctrine made in the omitted paragraph of the Article of 1552 is fully set forth.

But, no doubt, when we are considering the precise meaning of the 28th Article as it now stands, *in itself*, the fact of the alteration, and its real bearing and extent, properly come under review.

The 29th Article is so clear on this point, that it really is necessary to resort to the Archdeacon's explanation of it to find out how anything but a direct condemnation of his doctrine can be extorted from it. According to the express statement of the Title, its object is to declare, that the wicked "eat *not* the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," while the main point for which the Archdeacon contends is, that the wicked *do* eat the Body of Christ therein. Statements more directly and formally contradicting each other could not be conceived.

Let us now proceed to the Archdeacon's interpretation of these Articles. His first argument is derived from the last paragraph of Art. XXV. And he makes these observations upon it:[1]—

[1] I have not noticed above the Archdeacon's remark that this paragraph "belongs *exclusively* to the Holy Communion," because it does not affect our present subject; but I must here point out its glaring absurdity. That the word "sacraments" should, when occurring more than once in the former part

"1. That 'the receiving' of the sacraments is here carefully distinguished from their 'effect or operation;'" in which I perfectly agree with him:—"2. That it is *the same Sacraments* which

of the Article, be interpreted (as it must) to mean *the rites* of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and yet in this paragraph to mean the two elements of the Lord's Supper only, is what no impartial reader will listen to. And as to the "proof" to which he refers, all that has been done in that way by the author (Mr. Britton) to whom he refers, is to prove, that the elements in the Lord's Supper are by many of our old authors called "sacraments," which I suppose nobody would deny. But as the Archdeacon has also referred here to Mr. Britton as having proved in his "Horæ Sacramentales" (pp. 49, 50), that the word "sacraments" "is never used by the Church to mean the outward parts or sign only," I must detain the reader for a few minutes to give him a specimen whereby he may judge of the competency both of the Archdeacon and Mr. Britton to deal with such a subject. Seeing this reference to Mr. Britton's "Horæ Sacramentales," I immediately consulted that work (which I had not before seen) to ascertain by what wonderful process he had arrived at the *proof* of such a staggering proposition, in the very teeth of the definition of a "sacrament" given in our Catechism. I will not now attempt to reply to the numerous notices with which I found myself honoured, except to say that the remarks are about as well founded, even so far as concerns the representation of my own language, as those to which I am now about to call the attention of the reader. I cannot do Mr. Britton *full justice* without quoting his own words. I will therefore give them entire. "An attempt has been made," he says, "and received countenance in *quarters whence it might least have been expected*, to induce THE UNLEARNED IN ECCLESIASTICAL LANGUAGE to believe, that the Church by 'sacraments' means no more than the outward forms or signs distinct from the hidden and Divine thing of the Sacrament. Happily we have Bishop Jewel's oft-repeated denial of this heresy. The Papist Harding, to serve his own purpose, broached this erroneous and *then* novel distinction, and as oft as he produced it, he was met by the Bishop with a charge of falsehood. Harding's words are these: 'The word "sacrament" is taken so as it is distinct from that hidden and divine thing of the Sacrament; that is to say, *for the outward forms only*, which are the holy signs of Christ's very Body present under them contained. Whereof we must gather, that whensoever the Fathers do call this most excellent Sacrament a figure or a sign, they would be understanded to mean none otherwise *than of those outward forms*, and *not* of Christ's Body itself, which is there present, not typically or figuratively, but really and substantially.'"

Before we proceed to Mr. Britton's quotation from Jewel in reply to this, let us just notice the meaning of the words here quoted. The Papist Harding, as every one having the slightest knowledge of Roman Catholic doctrine will be aware, and as of course the context of the passage shows, is here speaking of "*the visible shape*" (to use his own word) of the elements, which the Romanists suppose to remain after *the substance* of bread and wine is gone and has given place to the Body and Blood of Christ, and this "*visible shape*" or "*outward form*" existing in the absence of the substance he (like the rest of the Romanists) calls the Sacrament, and says that when the Fathers called the Sacrament a figure, they referred only to these *outward forms*. Mr. Britton, in utter ignorance, as it seems, of the Romish doctrine on the subject, and not even giving himself time to learn it from Harding's own words in this place, applies Harding's

are received' 'worthily' or 'unworthily;'" in which also I thoroughly agree with him :—" 3. That the 'effect or operation' of 'worthily receiving' is 'wholesome'—the 'effect or operation' of 'unworthily receiving' is the 'purchasing of damnation as S. Paul saith;'" in which also I quite agree with him. And then, having proceeded to "observe," that "the sacraments received by those 'worthily receiving' at the Lord's Table are the sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ," he deduces the conclusion,—"*Wherefore* the sacraments received by those unworthily receiving at the Lord's Table are the sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ."

Why the Archdeacon should spend two pages in getting out this conclusion, I know not; for he might as well have spent the same labour in proving that two and two make four.

But, not content with this, he proceeds to tell us that "there are two ways of escape, and two only, from this conclusion. 1. By denying *in toto* the consecrating power. 2. By assuming

phrase, *outward forms*, as meaning the bread and wine!! And finding Jewel denying (as of course he does most earnestly) Harding's statement, holding that not the "*outward form*" but "*the substance* of the bread is the sacrament of Christ's Body," he sets down Jewel as maintaining, that the Fathers never used the word Sacraments to signify the consecrated bread and wine alone!! He says triumphantly,—"Upon these words Bishop Jewel made the following note: 'The 187th untruth. For none of the learned Fathers ever called the outward form a Sacrament. Christ's Body itself is a figure.'" And he adds several other passages from Bishop Jewel to the same effect, with the garnish of triumphant italics and capitals, and sarcastic ridicule of those (myself among the number) who, he tells us, "have not the merit even of *originality*, but these *good Protestants* have, unconsciously perhaps, revived the *untruths* of Dr. Harding the *Papist*."

I am sure "*the unlearned in ecclesiastical language*" ought to feel greatly indebted to Mr. Britton for his learned instructions in this matter, and the gentlemen he censures ought hardly to venture to show their faces after such an exposure, even if they did it, as Mr. Britton so kindly conjectures, "unconsciously perhaps."

But, in all seriousness, what a specimen have we here of the amount of information on the strength of which some among us will undertake to dogmatise on such subjects. It would be absolutely impossible for Mr. Britton even to read the passages of Jewel he has quoted, in connexion with their *immediate* context, without seeing his mistake, even though not aware previously of what the Romish doctrine in question was. And I fear I must add, it is but a fair specimen of the whole work, for the book abounds in misstatements and misrepresentations.

And to such blundering as this Archdeacon Denison gravely refers for the *proof* of one of the leading positions in his Sermons.

that which we have no ground or warrant to assume, viz., that the unworthiness of any one receiving *unmakes*, at the moment of receiving, *the sacraments* which have been *made* by the consecrating power."[1]

Now I can assure the Archdeacon, that I have no wish at all to "escape" from the "conclusion" alluded to, but hold it as firmly as he does, but not *his* interpretation of the words; and he must permit me to remind him, that from the conclusion with his interpretation attached to it, there is a *third* way of escape, and that is "by denying *in toto*" that the Archdeacon understands what "the consecrating power" is, and what it effects. By consecration, the bread and wine are made (what they were not before) sacred symbols or sacraments (that is, as our Catechism explains the word, outward signs) of the Body and Blood of Christ, in the participation of which Christ himself is present to the faithful recipient, and I quite agree with him, that the unworthiness of a communicant does not "*unmake*" the Sacrament to him, but that on the contrary he receives the same sacrament as the worthy recipient, and so incurs a high degree of guilt for his profanation of holy things; but from his want of that "faith," which is "the mean" by which the Body and Blood of Christ are received, he does not receive that Body and Blood.

And I can further certify the Archdeacon, in reply to his additional argument from Art. XXVI, that I hold as much as he does the truth of the statement in that Article, that sacraments, although they be ministered by evil men, are effectual because of Christ's institution and promise; but the question is, *what it is which is effected by consecration;* and when he proceeds to tell us, that the act of consecration makes the sacrament Christ's Body and Blood,[2] I must remind him that such an affirmation, made in direct contradiction to the statements of his own Church, proves nothing; and upon *it*, and not upon anything he has found in the Articles, rests his whole evidence for his *final conclusion*,[3] that "those who receive unworthily receive the Body and Blood of Christ." He has himself told us, that the only conclusion that follows from the language of the Articles

[1] Serm. 2. pp. 115, 116; 3rd ed. p. 78. [2] Serm. 2. p. 116; 3rd ed. p. 78.
[3] Serm. 2. p. 117; 3rd ed. p. 79.

is, that they receive "*the sacraments* of the Body and Blood of Christ."

The Archdeacon proceeds to Article XXVIII., and he tells us, that,—

"It says nothing about those who 'receive' it [the sacrament] 'unworthily;' but it *implies* plainly, that while these 'receive' it no less than those who come 'worthily and with faith,' it *is not* to them a 'partaking' of the Body and Blood of Christ. And in this it accords exactly with Art. XXIX, which *says expressly* of 'the wicked and such as be devoid of a lively faith,' that 'in no wise are they *partakers* of Christ.'"

Such is the admission which the plain language of the Article *forces* from the Archdeacon. He admits that it *implies*, and that Article XXIX "expressly says," that the unworthy, though they "receive" the sacrament, are not "partakers of" the Body and Blood of Christ. And the reader may well be disposed to ask, what becomes then of the very foundation of the Archdeacon's whole argumentation, that every one who receives the sacrament does in and by that act eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ; or, to use his own words in this very place,[1] that "the sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, are "*the outward parts or signs, and the inward parts or things signified, so joined together by the act of consecration that* TO RECEIVE THE ONE IS TO RECEIVE THE OTHER." And I must call the reader's particular attention to the extraordinary expedient to which the Archdeacon has resort to evade this difficulty. He says,— "Thus then it appears from Articles xxv., xxviii., xxix., taken in "connection, that there are:—1. Those who both receive and "partake of the Body and Blood of Christ. 2. THOSE WHO "RECEIVE, BUT DO NOT PARTAKE OF, THE BODY "AND BLOOD OF CHRIST"!!

Now here certainly the Archdeacon has far exceeded the Romanists themselves in the mysteriousness with which he has shrouded the Eucharistic rite. For, that we should in it *receive and eat and drink of* a thing of which nevertheless we do *not partake*, is a marvel transcending even all that is included in the doctrine of Transubstantiation. And here he entirely de-

[1] Serm. 2. p. 118; 3rd ed. p. 79.

serts his "great authority," Archdeacon Wilberforce, who says that "the *res sacramenti*, according to the Church-system, is *partaken by* all."[1] But then the Archdeacon is conscious, that he must either take refuge in this, or give up the very groundwork on which his whole argumentation rests, namely, that the act of consecration so joins the Body and Blood of Christ to the bread and wine that "to receive the one is to receive the other."

But, unfortunately for the Archdeacon, beyond the difficulty which arises from *the words themselves*, it so happens, (as he himself is obliged to confess,) that in the Communion Service "the "words 'partake,' 'partakers,' are used in contexts which *do* "*not restrict* their use to those worthily receiving, but extend it "to those unworthily receiving."[2] Here surely is a formidable difficulty; because such a discrepancy in the use of words could hardly be imagined in the Articles and the Communion Service. Not so, however, thinks the Archdeacon, who only considers it necessary to add *ex cathedra*, "But in the Articles the word 'partaker' is *so restricted*." And so, *Archidiaconus locutus est, causa finita est.*

Will the Archdeacon permit me to add one more *knot* for him to *cut?* The Article says, that "*the mean* whereby the Body of Christ is RECEIVED and eaten in the Supper is *faith*."

The Archdeacon proceeds to the XXIXth Article, and having directed his attention first to the heading of it, which is, "Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," he says,—"The question is, what is meant by 'eating the Body of Christ;' " and having gone again over ground which we have already considered, he concludes,—"Now I contend that it is the eating of the Body of Christ "*unto life*, to which the heading of the Article refers;" and then comes his proof from the Article itself, that such is the case. I will give it in his own words:—"For the Article itself *dis-*"*tinctly affirms* of 'the wicked, and such as be void of a lively "faith,' that they *do* eat and drink the Body and Blood of "Christ; not in such sort as the other do, 'but rather, to "their condemnation.' "[3]

[1] WILB. Doctr. of Euch., pp. 142, 143; 3rd ed. p. 122.
[2] Serm. 2. p. 118; 3rd ed. p. 80. [3] Serm. 2. p. 121; 3rd ed. p. 82.

Now I must say, that it is difficult to speak of such a mode of dealing with the Article in the terms which it demands, without using language which it is desirable as far as possible to avoid. That it calls for the severest reprobation, will hardly be denied by any one who reads the Article as given above, p. 645. The Article is here quoted as affirming the very thing which it was its avowed object to deny; and the misrepresentation is effected by citing a few words out of their context in precisely the opposite sense to that in which they are used in the Article, and concealing the words that *expressly* condemn his doctrine. We are told that the Article says, that the wicked *do* eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, not in such sort as the faithful do, "but rather to their condemnation." Now what is the language of the Article?—"*In no wise* are they partakers of Christ, but rather, to their condemnation, DO EAT AND DRINK THE SIGN OR SACRAMENT OF SO GREAT A THING."

What confidence the reader can have after this in the Archdeacon's representations of the language of our Formularies, I know not; but I must say, for my own part, that much as I have seen of the dealings of his party with our Formularies and the works of our divines, I never met with an instance of more bold and palpable misrepresentation than is to be found in this passage. The words omitted by the Archdeacon, though the citation of them was absolutely necessary to show what the words he quoted mean, form of themselves a complete and decisive refutation of his whole argument, because they show us *what it is* which the wicked are held to receive, namely, "THE SIGN *or sacrament*" only of the Body and Blood of Christ. And the expression, "*the sign* OR *sacrament*," proves that the word "sacrament" is used in such passages as meaning only *the sign*.

But, while the Archdeacon carefully conceals from the reader *the proof* which the Article affords of his misrepresentation of it, he thinks it worth his while to anticipate the possibility of an objection being started, on the ground that by the expression "sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" is meant the outward sign *only*; and gives three answers to it:—

"1. If so, the sacrament is *unmade, and it is no longer a sacrament.*"

To this, of course, it is only necessary to reply, that the Archdeacon ought to know, that when the word sacrament is applied to the elements themselves, it means only a sacred symbol or representative of the thing signified, constituted such by the act of consecration; and that his interpretation of the phrase, "the sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ," which makes the word "sacraments" mean "the bread with the Body of Christ and the wine with the Blood of Christ," turns the phrase into nonsense.

"2. That the words are *never* so used by the Church."

To this, of course, after the evidence given above, no answer is necessary but a simple denial.

"3. That the context of the Article makes it impossible that this should be their meaning. For, if 'the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ' be used in the Article to signify the Bread and Wine only, there is no room for the words 'carnally and visibly:' because these words are not, and indeed cannot be, *a qualification* of 'pressing with the teeth' *what is Bread and Wine only;* since *what is Bread and Wine only* cannot be 'pressed with the teeth' in any other way than 'carnally and visibly.' In this case, therefore, the words 'carnally and visibly' could have *no place* in the context. But they *are,* on the other hand, *a qualification* of 'pressing with the teeth' 'the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ'—'the outward part or sign' and 'the inward part or thing signified,' so joined together by the act of consecration, that to receive the one is to receive the other—and therefore, are truly and properly used in this context; and have been used in this context for the precise reason, that 'the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ' can be 'pressed with the teeth' 'carnally and visibly,' and 'unto condemnation;' as by those who receive it unworthily; and also, at the same time that it is 'given' and 'received' outwardly, can be 'taken and eaten' spiritually, inwardly, and unto life; as by those who receive it worthily."[1]

I have given this extraordinary passage entire, that the Archdeacon might not be able to find any fault with my representation of his argument.

The argument of the Archdeacon, therefore, is this; that if

[1] Serm. 2, pp. 122, 123; 3rd ed. pp. 82, 83.

the sacrament consists of bread and wine only, it can be "pressed with the teeth" *only* "carnally and visibly;" but if it consists of bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ in a spiritual and immaterial form joined together, then it can be *"pressed with the teeth" not only "carnally and visibly," but* "SPIRITUALLY, INWARDLY AND UNTO LIFE;" and that this is done by the faithful; who, we must conclude, "press with the teeth" the material part "carnally and visibly," and the immaterial part "spiritually."

Now certainly this species of spiritual manducation is quite a novel idea. To "press with the teeth" "spiritually" is something that passes my poor comprehension. And it would follow that if a cannibal was to eat a living man, he could "press with his teeth" not only in a carnal and visible way the material flesh, but, in a spiritual way, the immaterial spirit itself. I confess I was never before aware of the power of the teeth. I had always thought that the teeth could only press things carnally and visibly, and I think that this has been the view hitherto taken by the great majority of mankind, and that the Archdeacon will have some difficulty in removing our prejudices and scepticism on the point.

And another equally remarkable consequence seems to follow from this interpretation, namely, that the wicked (who according to the Archdeacon receive the body and blood of Christ equally with the faithful) "press with their teeth" the body and blood of Christ present in a *spiritual* and *immaterial* form "carnally and visibly."

To argue seriously on such an interpretation of these words, would be a waste of time.

I need hardly add, that the contrast presented by the Article is this, that though the wicked do, like the faithful, carnally and visibly press with their teeth the sacrament, and so *outwardly* do just what the faithful do, and receive what the faithful receive, yet are they "in no wise partakers of Christ," because they do not receive that sacrament with *faith*, "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper." The whole phrase "carnally and visibly pressing with the teeth" the sacrament,—which relates to what is done by believers and unbelievers in common,—is put in contrast with *that inward*

and spiritual act of the faithful by which they feed on the real body and blood of Christ.

The Archdeacon, in conclusion, gravely observes, that the interpretation given to the Article by those who differ from him, is "a *non-natural* interpretation"—a remark which I will leave in the hands of the reader.

But Archdeacon Denison, like Archdeacon Wilberforce, attempts to get rid of the evidence against his doctrine supplied by this Article by a criticism on the meaning of the words attributed to Augustine quoted in it, and also by the use made of them in the Church of Rome. He alleges that the words quoted from Augustine support his doctrine;[1] and that it must be so, because Augustine "held, as is abundantly plain from many passages in his writings, that the 'res sacramenti,' the inward part or Thing signified—the Body and Blood of Christ—is received by *all* communicants."[2] And further, that the circumstance that those who drew up the Articles preferred that reading of the passage of Augustine which they have adopted, shows what their view was in quoting it.[3] And moreover, that these words of Augustine were "adopted into Lectio VIII. of the Roman Office, 'in Festo Corporis Christi,' in the form in which they stand in that Office to this day, by S. Thomas Aquinas, the framer of the Office, in the year of grace 1255;[4] and therefore that as "the substance of Art. XXIX. is formed" of these words of Augustine, and the Romanists have adopted them into one of their Services, they cannot exclude the idea of the wicked eating the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

Let us consider these various allegations separately.

And first as to the argument that Augustine's words must of necessity support the Archdeacon's doctrine, because other passages of Augustine's works show, that he held that the inward part or thing signified is received by *all* communicants. This allegation has been so fully met in a previous part of this work,[5] that I add nothing further here on that point.

And if the reader considers that the proof there given, that Augustine did *not* hold this view, is satisfactory, this argument

[1] Serm. 2, pp. 123, 124; 3rd ed. pp. 83, 84. [2] Serm. 2. p. 123; 3rd ed. pp. 83, 84.
[3] Serm. 2, App. note B. pp. 139, 140; 3rd ed. pp. 94, 95.
[4] Serm. 3, p. 162; 3rd ed. p. 110. [5] See pp. 350—365 above.

of the Archdeacon falls back with conclusive force upon himself.

And so far as Augustine himself is concerned, the true reading of the passage to which the Article refers, (as is admitted by both the Archdeacons) is, as I have already shown,[1] entirely and beyond question opposed to the doctrine here controverted.

But, doubtless, another question arises as to the meaning of the words given as from Augustine in the Article.

Now I have already admitted,[2] that the words, "although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," are not the words of Augustine, but added in connexion with *another more significant addition* at a later period, and probably by some one who wished to garble the passage so as to get rid of the *direct denial*, contained in the real words of Augustine, of such a view as that of the Archdeacon, and to render it *capable of explanation* consistently with that view.

But I deny that the passage of Augustine here referred to, *even in its garbled state*, maintains the doctrine of the Archdeacon; and I think no impartial person, comparing it even in that state with other parts of Augustine's writings, would be inclined to affix such an interpretation to it.

The words of Augustine are these :—

"And consequently he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, beyond doubt neither eats his flesh, nor drinks his blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation." [3]

The passage, as garbled, stands thus :—

"And consequently he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, beyond doubt neither eats spiritually his flesh, nor drinks his blood; although he carnally and visibly press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; but rather eats and drinks the sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation." [4]

Now the chief force of the passage lies in the words at the close of it, which clearly state that *the only thing* which an unworthy

[1] See pp. 356, 357 above.
[2] See pp. 356, 357 above.
[3] See p. 356 above, *note*.
[4] Ibid.

communicant eats is "the sacrament of" the Body and Blood of Christ. The meaning of the passage, therefore, even in its garbled state, depends upon the meaning given to the word *sacrament*. And it is clear from other parts of Augustine's works what he meant by the word *sacrament* when so used.[1] And certainly the meaning attached to it in the Article cannot be doubted, because there the word *sign* is added *as its synonym* —"the *sign or* sacrament of so great a thing."

Nay, the Archdeacon himself tells us, in this very place, that Augustine "suggested those distinctions in respect of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, which were elaborated by divines who succeeded him, and which are stated with great exactness in our own Catechism. 1. Sacramentum—'outward part or sign.' 2. Res sacramenti—'inward part or thing signified.' 3. Virtus, or, Gratia sacramenti—'benefits whereof we are partakers thereby.'"[2] Therefore, according to the Archdeacon himself, "the outward part or sign" is by Augustine and the Catechism called "sacramentum" or "sacrament."

And as to the Archbishop *preferring* this representation of Augustine's words to the other (as the Archdeacon urges), there is not the slightest force in the argument; because the Archbishop gave what was the ordinary reading of them at the time, when the text had not been critically emended as it has since been.

And we may observe, that our learned Bishop Beveridge, in his Commentary on the Articles, quotes at length the passage of Augustine in its garbled state, and unhesitatingly deduces from it a doctrine opposed to that of the Archdeacon. And unfortunately for the Archdeacon, the words quoted in the Article are not those by which the doctrine of Augustine is obscured. That part of the addition which effected that object occurs in a former part of the sentence, where, instead of Augustine's words, that one who dwelleth not in Christ *does not eat his flesh*, the interpolator garbled the passage by inserting the word "*spiritually*" before "*eat;*" intending it to imply that such a one might *eat* Christ's flesh, though *not spiritually*. But this is not quoted in the Article, and the words that are quoted are perfectly harmless and unobjectionable, and are inserted in the Article with

[1] See pp. 250—260 above.

[2] Serm. 2, pp. 123, 124; 3rd ed. p. 84.

others which show fully *the sense in which they were quoted.* And the question we have here to consider is, *for what purpose and with what view* the passage of Augustine was quoted in the Article.

The meaning of the Article does not depend upon the true meaning of the words of Augustine; for the doctrine of the Article is clearly, though summarily, laid down in the *title;* and whatever might be the precise meaning of the words of Augustine, the question here is, *what doctrine they were cited to prove?* They may have been incorrectly cited, but that will not make the doctrine of the Article different from what its title shows it to be. If I was to argue that the Archdeacon had cited a certain text of Scripture in proof of a particular statement, and that the true meaning of that text was of such or such a nature, and had then drawn the conclusion that therefore the doctrine of the Archdeacon was of the same kind, he would justly accuse me of charging him with the maintenance of a doctrine for which he was not responsible. The case here is precisely the same.

And fortunately the history of this Article so completely settles the question, that I can hardly suppose that it was known to either of the Archdeacons. This Article was inserted in the Articles of 1562 as settled by Convocation; but, on passing under the eye of the Queen and her Council previous to publication, was struck out; so that in none of the editions of the Articles before 1571 does this Article appear. But in the revision of the Articles made by Convocation and sanctioned by Parliament in that year, it was re-inserted, and was then permitted by the Queen and Council to form part of them, as it appeared in all the editions from that date. And it appears from a letter of Archbishop Parker to the Treasurer (Cecil) of that year, that some persons had objected that the passage quoted from Augustine did not mean what it was cited for in the Article, and that Archbishop Parker defended the relevancy of the citation.

"Some, it seems," says Strype, "had raised a scruple of the sentence of St. Augustine, alleged there, put in for proof of it [i.e., *that the wicked eat not the Body of Christ*] by the Archbishop himself. . . . . That it rightly and properly was cited to his purpose, he told the said Treasurer occasionally in a letter to him soon after; viz. 'That he was advisedly still in his opinion, concerning so much as

it was alleged for in the Article. And that for further truth of the words, besides St. Augustin, both he in other places, and Prosper in his Sentences out of Augustin, *Senten.* 338 and 339, did plainly affirm this opinion in that Article to be most true: however some men, he said, varied from it.' " [1]

Now, if Archbishop Parker had been quoting this passage in favor of the view that the wicked, though they eat the body of Christ, do not eat it so as to obtain any salutary effect from it, in opposition to those who quoted it to prove that the wicked do not eat the body of Christ at all, he certainly would not have expressed the proposition to be proved in the terms he has, namely, that the wicked "eat not the body of Christ." He must, therefore, have been quoting it in favor of the *latter* view, in opposition to those who quoted it in favor of the former.

And his reference to the "Sentences" of Prosper shows that this was the case. For the two Sentences he has quoted are as follows:—

"*Of the Body of Christ.*"

"The flesh of Christ is the life of the faithful, if they neglect not to be his body. Therefore let them become the body of Christ, if they would live by the Spirit of Christ; by which none lives but the body of Christ."

"*Who eat the Body of Christ.*"

"He who dwells in Christ, and in whom Christ dwells, receives the food of life, and drinks the cup of immortality. For he who is discordant from Christ, *neither eats his flesh, nor drinks his blood*, although he may daily invariably receive the sacrament of so great a thing to the condemnation of his own presumption." [2]

[1] Strype's Life of Parker, pp. 331, 332; or (Oxf. ed.) Vol. 2. pp. 78, 79. The precise words of Archbishop Parker's note to Lord Burghley, dated June 4, 1571, are thus given in the Petyt MS. printed in the "Correspondence of M. Parker," published by the Parker Society. "Sir, I have considered what your honour said to me this day concerning St. Augustine's authority in the Article in the first original agreed upon; and I am advisedly still in mine opinion concerning so much wherefore they be alleged in the Article; and for further truth of the words, besides St. Austin, both he in other places, and Prosper in his 'Sentences wrote of Austin' (Senten. 338 and 339) doth *plainly affirm our opinion in the Article to be most true, however some men vary from it.*" Corresp. &c. p. 381.

[2] *De corpore Christi.*

Caro Christi fidelium vita est, si corpus ipsius esse non negligant. Fiant ergo corpus Christi, si volunt vivere de Spiritu Christi; de quo non vivit, nisi corpus Christi.

There can be no doubt which view of the meaning of Augustine is supported by these "Sentences" of Prosper.

The doctrine, therefore, which the quotation from Augustine in the Article was intended to maintain is unquestionable, and the meaning of the Article clear.

And the Archdeacon is bound by his own admission to confess that this evidence determines the question against him. For he himself says,—"Even supposing there to be any room "for reasonable doubt touching S. Augustine's teaching in this "particular—which there is not—it must not be forgotten "after all, that *the question for us is not what S. Augustine "taught, but in what sense the framers of the Article have "adopted his words as expository of the doctrine of the Church "of England.*"[1]

Nothing can be more true than this, and it completely settles the question against the Archdeacon.

And to make the matter still clearer, the term *sign* is added in the Article (as I have already observed) to the words of Augustine, in order apparently to render it impossible that there should be any mistake on the subject; for the words of Augustine are only—"the sacrament of so great a thing,"[2] but the Article says,—"the *sign, or* sacrament of so great a thing."

As to the introduction of the passage, in its garbled form, into a Romish Service, we may at once dispose of any argument derived from such a circumstance. It is merely a specimen of their mode of dealing in such matters. The passage is first garbled so that it can be twisted to a sense in conformity with Romish views, and then inserted as a Patristical testimony in their favor. And thereby a double advantage is gained to their cause. An adverse testimony is obscured, and one which can be favorably twisted is advanced to view.

Qui edunt corpus Christi.

Escam vitæ accipit, et æternitatis poculum bibit, qui in Christo manet, et cujus Christus habitator est. Nam qui discordat a Christo, nec carnem ejus manducat, nec sanguinem bibit: etiam si tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidie indifferenter accipiat.

PROSPER. AQUIT. Liber Sentent. ex Augustino. Sentent. *sec. vet. ord.* 338, 339; *sec. al. ord.* 340, 341; *sec. ord. Sirmondi,* 342, 343. Op. ed. Sirmond. col. 596; or, in August. Op. ed. cit. tom. x. App. col. 166.

[1] Serm. 2. App. note B, p. 140; 3rd ed. p. 95.

[2] See p. 356 above.

As a further evidence that the meaning here attributed to the 29th Article is that which properly belongs to it, we may observe that this Article, as it stands, was introduced into the Articles agreed upon in the Convocation of the Irish Church held at Dublin in 1615, in that part which treats of the Lord's Supper, where it is connected with the following statement :—

"In the outward part of the Holy Communion the body and blood of Christ is in a most lively manner represented; BEING NO OTHERWISE PRESENT WITH THE VISIBLE ELEMENTS, THAN THINGS SIGNIFIED AND SEALED ARE PRESENT WITH THE SIGNS AND SEALS, THAT IS TO SAY, SYMBOLICALLY AND RELATIVELY. But in the inward and spiritual part the same body and blood is really and substantially presented unto all those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in his name. And unto such as in this manner do worthily and with faith repair unto the Lord's Table, the body and blood of Christ is not only signified and offered, but also truly exhibited and communicated."[1]

There can be no doubt, therefore, as to the meaning affixed to the words of our 29th Article by those who inserted them in this Confession not many years after they were put into the English Articles. The views of the authors of this Confession, and the fact of their inserting in it, almost word for word, the Lambeth Articles of 1595, would alone place this beyond question.

But before we leave the consideration of the Articles, it seems but reasonable to inquire, what interpretation has hitherto been given to them by those divines of our Church who have formally commented upon them. And I shall now proceed to place before the reader the interpretation given to the Articles which concern our present subject by *all* the Commentators on the Articles for two centuries succeeding their final settlement in 1571.

The earliest Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles was that by Thomas Rogers. It was originally published under the title of "The English Creede, consenting with the true Auncient Catholique and Apostolique Church in al the Points and Articles of Religion which everie Christian is to knowe and beleeve that would be saved," &c. Part I., containing the first nine-

[1] Irish Articles of 1615. Wilk. Conc. iv. 453.

teen Articles, was printed, Lond. J. Windet, 1585. fol.; Part II., containing the remainder, Lond. R. Waldegrave, 1587. fol. But in 1607 a considerably enlarged edition of the work was published under the title,—"The faith doctrine and religion professed and protected in the Realme of England and dominions of the same: expressed in 39 Articles, concordablie agreed upon &c. . . . . the said Articles analised into propositions, and the propositions prooved to be agreeable both to the written word of God and to the extant Confessions of all the neighbour Churches, Christianlie reformed" &c. This book is said in the title to have been "Perused, and by the lawfull authoritie of the Church of England allowed to be publique," and was *dedicated to Archbishop Bancroft, to whom Rogers was Chaplain.* And we are told by a contemporary that this book "*came abroad with injunction from the Archbishop that then was that there should be one of them bought for every Parish in the Province of Canterbury.*"[1]

This work, therefore, must be considered as having had a certain degree of public authority given to it, and that under the Archiepiscopate of Archbishop Bancroft, who is considered to have belonged to what is commonly called the High Church party of his day.

In this work will be found the following statements.

In his exposition of the 25th Article, the eleventh "proposition," he deduces from it is as follows:—"All which receive the sacraments, receive not therewithal the things signified by the sacraments." And he adds, as "the proof from God's word,"—"We read in the Holy Scripture that some per-
"sons do receive the sacraments and the things signified by the
"sacraments, which are the remission of sins and other spiritual
"graces from God: and so received was the sacrament of bap-
"tism of Cornelius, and the Lord's Supper of the good disciples
"and the godly Corinthians. Some again receive the sacra-
"ments, but not the things by them signified: so received was
"the baptism of Simon Magus, and the Lord's Supper of Judas;
"and so receive the Atheists, Libertines, and impenitent per-
"sons."[2]

Again, in his exposition of the 28th Article, he uses against

[1] Dr. Burges's Baptismal Regeneration of Elect Infants. Oxf. 1629. 4to. p. 68.
[2] T. Rogers, The Faith, Doctrine, &c. ed. 1607. 4to. p. 159.

the doctrine of Transubstantiation arguments that apply equally against any doctrine involving the notion of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in or conjoined to the bread and wine. He observes—

"'I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine,' saith our Saviour Christ: which fruit had it really been either the Blood, or by way of concomitance, the very Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, then *our Lord had eaten himself, which is not only blasphemous to be spoken, but also impossible to be done, and directly against the word of God*, where commandment is often given, that the blood with flesh (not of beast, much less of man) must not be eaten. 'The heaven must contain Jesus Christ until the time that all things be restored,' saith S. Peter. If Christ therefore corporally, according to his humanity, be in heaven, then is he *not in the sacrament*. 'As often as ye shall eat this bread (*not Christ his real body*) and drink this cup (*not the real blood of Christ*) you show the Lord's death till he come,' saith S. Paul. Therefore he is not come; which he must be, being under the forms of bread and wine."[1]

And he proceeds to notice as an "abominable Popish error," the doctrine that "substantially and really the Body and Blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore Christ, is contained in the sacrament eucharistical"[2]—a doctrine affirmed *in terms* by Archdeacon Wilberforce,[3] and substantially by the other Authors under review.

And, expounding the words, "The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner," he says—"The life spiritual is peculiar only to "God's elect, and is cherished by the bread of life, which came "down from heaven, which is Jesus Christ, who nourisheth "and sustaineth the spiritual life of Christians, being received "of them by faith. (John vi. 35.) Which spiritual bread that "he might the better represent, he hath instituted earthly and "visible bread and wine, for a sacrament of his Body and Blood. "Whereby he doth testify, that as verily as we receive the "bread with the hands, and chew the same with the teeth and "tongue, to the nourishing of this life temporal, even so by "faith, which is in place of hands and mouth to the soul, we

[1] Ibid. pp. 173, 174. [2] Ibid. p. 174. [3] See p. 173 above.

"verily receive the true Body and the true Blood of Christ, "our only Saviour, to the cherishing of the spiritual life in our "souls. And herein there is a goodly consent with the most "of the Reformed Churches and us. (Confess. Helvet. 1. ar. 22, "and 2. c. 21. Basil. ar. 6. Bohem. c. 13. Gal. ar. 36. Belg. "ar. 35.)"

And he proceeds to notice, among "the adversaries unto this truth," "the Synusiasts, or Ubiquitaries, which think the Body "of Christ so is present in the Supper as [that] his said Body "with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one "and the same time, of all and every communicant, is eaten "corporally and received into the belly"[2]—*the very doctrine of the Authors under review.*

Further, in his exposition of the 29th Article, speaking of those who receive unworthily, he says, "*These may receive the sacrament, but not the true Body of Christ;*" and having given the reason for this, he adds,—"Of this judgment be other "Churches Christian and Reformed besides. (Confess. Helvet. "1. in the declar. of the L. Supper. Helvet. 2. c. 21. Basil. ar. 6. "Bohem. c. 13. Gall. ar. 37. Belg. ar. 37.)"[3]—showing that he considered the doctrine of our Church in this Article to be the same as that of the Confessions of the Reformed Churches here referred to.

And he subjoins,—

"The adversaries of this doctrine are the Ubiquitaries, both Lutheran and Popish; they saying the very Body of Christ at the Lord's Supper is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly; these affirming, that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural Body of Christ Jesus: they saying, that the true and real Body of Christ, in, with, under the bread and wine may be eaten, chewed and digested even of Turks, which never were of the Church, and these maintaining that under the form of bread the same true and real Body of Christ may be devoured of dogs, hogs, cats and rats."[4]

The Exposition of the Articles by Thomas Rogers was frequently reprinted during the 17th century, and was the only professed Commentary on them that appeared previous to that

[1] Ibid. p. 175. [2] Ibid. p. 176. [3] Ibid. pp. 178, 179. [4] Ibid. p. 179.

of Bishop Burnet, which was first published in the year 1699. Nor was there, as far as I am aware, any treatise written on them by a divine of our own Church between the two, with the exception of a little work that first appeared in 1660, written by Dr. John Elis, Rector of Dolgelly, Merionethshire, frequently reprinted, and referred to by subsequent writers, entitled "Articulorum XXXIX. Eccles. Anglic. Defensio," in which the Author gives the chief objections that may be brought against the statements of the Articles, and subjoins answers to them.

On the 28th Article the second objection he notices is, that the true body and blood of Christ are said to be given to the communicant; to which he replies,—"Appellatur verum Christi "corpus, et verus Christi sanguis; sed quasi *secundario* et *repræ-* "*sentative;* sic dicimus *de imagine Cæsaris, Hic est Cæsar,* qui "vicit Pompeium."[1]

The third objection is, that the words of institution are to be understood *literally;* to which he replies,—"Verba Testamen- "torum possunt esse clara, etiamsi *figurata;* omnis tropus non "est obscurus; est enim aliquando lumen orationis; habetur "etiam tropus Luc. xxii. 20, ubi calix dicitur esse Novum Tes- "tamentum; nec discipulorum ruditas debuit impedire locu- "tionem in omnibus sacramentis usitatam, quia semper aliquid "significant."[2]

The fourth objection is, that Christ is omnipotent, and therefore can give his body in the Eucharist under the forms of bread and wine; to which he replies,—"A posse ad esse non valet "consequentia; non quæritur quid possit Christus, sed quid "velit; præterea Christus omnia potest quæ *non implicant con-* "*tradictionem; at implicat, unum et idem corpus simul esse in* "*cœlo et in sacramento.*"[3]

Again, on the 29th Article, the first objection he notices is,— "Integritatem sacramenti non pendere a fide sumentis, sed ab "authoritate instituentis; et proinde per incredulitatem hominis "non posse immutari vel evacuari."—To which he replies,— "Sacramenti late accepti integritas pendet ab utroque."[4]

The second objection is,—"Judam edisse corpus Domini, "et bibisse sanguinem Domini; Marcum testari omnes bibisse

[1] J. Elis, Art. xxxix. Defensio. ed. 4ta. Amstel. 1700. 12mo. p. 103.
[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. pp. 105, 106. [5] Ibid.

" ex calice benedicto, Marc. xiv. 23. Lucam scripsisse, Christum " peracta cœna hæc verba protulisse, Ecce manus tradentis " me mecum est in mensa, Luc. xxii. 21."—To which he re- " plies, — " Quidam negant Judam sacræ cœnæ interfuisse, " nedum de ea participasse; *utcunque se res habeat, si modo* " *interfuit, signum tantum et panem Domini, ut reliqui hypocritæ,* " *non signatum et panem Dominum, accepit.*"[1]

The third objection is,—" Paulum docere indignos esse reos corporis et sanguinis Christi, tanquam irreligiose perceptorum, 1 Cor. xi. 27."—To which he replies,—" Apostolus docet impios " fieri reos corporis Christi, *non quod illud vere accipiant,* sed " quia non discernunt, hoc est, non considerata cibi dignitate, " accedunt ad hanc mensam sine reverentia et timore."[2]

In 1699 appeared the Commentary of Bishop Burnet, the merits of which, notwithstanding the attacks made upon it from some quarters on its first appearance, have long been acknowledged in its having been, till within the last few years, the one in general use in our Church.

Large extracts might be given from this work in opposition to the doctrine of the Authors under review. But as the work is so well known, and of such common occurrence, I shall content myself with a few passages showing clearly the views maintained in it.

The comment on the 28th Article comes first for consideration, discussing the general question of the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. And Bishop Burnet notices first the alteration made in this Article (as already pointed out)[3] from the corresponding one in the Articles of 1552, on which he makes the following remarks:—

" When these Articles were at first prepared by the Convocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign, this paragraph [i.e. the paragraph which occurs in the corresponding Article of 1552, as given above] was made a part of them; for the original subscription by both Houses of Convocation, yet extant, shows this. But the design of the Government was at that time much turned to the drawing over the Body of the Nation to the Reformation, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament: therefore it was

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid. p. 106. [3] See p. 649 above.

thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter; in which the very word *Real Presence* was rejected. It might perhaps be also suggested, that here a definition was made that went too much upon the principles of natural philosophy; which how true soever, they might not be the proper subject of an Article of religion. Therefore it was thought fit to suppress this paragraph; though it was a part of the Article that was subscribed, yet it was not published, but the paragraph that follows, 'The Body of Christ,' &c., was put in its stead, and was received and published by the next Convocation; which upon the matter was a full explanation of the way of Christ's presence in the Sacrament; that 'he is present in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that faith is the mean by which he is received.' This seemed to be *more theological*, and IT DOES INDEED AMOUNT TO THE SAME THING. *But howsoever we see what was the sense of the first Convocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign; it differed in nothing from that in King Edward's time:* and therefore though this paragraph is now no part of our Articles, yet we are certain that the clergy at that time did not at all doubt of the truth of it; we are sure it was their opinion, since they subscribed it, though they did not think fit to publish it, at first; and though it was afterwards changed for another that was THE SAME IN SENSE."[1]

This is probably the true account of the reason for the alteration; and we see that Bishop Burnet considered the words of the Article as it now stands "*the same in sense*" as those in the Article of 1552; but that the doctrine was put (as it certainly is) in a more strictly theological form.[2]

Proceeding to discuss the general question of doctrine, the Bishop observes that our Lord—

"Did not say only, 'This is my body,' but 'This is my body broken;' so that his Body must be understood to be there in its *broken* state, if the words are to be expounded literally. . . . From thence we argue, that, since all is one period, it must be all understood in the same manner; and since it is impossible that *broken*

[1] BISHOP BURNET'S Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. 5th ed. Lond. 1746. 8vo. pp. 384, 385.

[2] So far as concerns the general question of our present obligations, the reintroduction of the rubric of the Communion Office of 1552 (with a slight alteration) in the revision of 1662, would bind us to the doctrine, even if the Article did not.

and *shed* can be understood literally of the *Body* and *Blood*, that therefore the whole is to be MYSTICALLY UNDERSTOOD." [1]

And again, on the words, "This is my blood," or, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," he says,—

"If the words are to be expounded literally, then if the cup is literally 'the blood of Christ,' it must be his blood 'shed,' poured out of his veins and separated from his Body. And if it is impossible to understand it so, we conclude that we are in the right to understand the whole period in A MYSTICAL AND FIGURATIVE SENSE." [2]

Of course the assertion that the words of institution are to be understood in *a mystical and figurative sense*, settles the whole question as to the views of the Bishop on the doctrine maintained by the Authors under review.

And proceeding to explain more particularly the doctrine of our Church, he thus notices the use and true meaning of the phrase *Real Presence* among us. He says that in "our doctrine concerning the sacrament"—

"We assert a *real presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ; but not of his Body as it is now glorified in heaven, but of his Body as it was broken on the Cross, when his blood was shed and separated from it: *that is, his death, with the merit and effects of it, are in a visible and federal act offered in this Sacrament to all worthy believers.* By *Real* we understand *True*, in opposition both to fiction and imagination: and to those shadows that were in the Mosaical Dispensation, in which the *Manna*, the *Rock*, the *Brazen Serpent*, but most eminently the *Cloud of glory*, were the types and shadows of the Messias that was to come: with whom came 'grace and truth,' that is, a most wonderful manifestation of the mercy or grace of God; and a verifying of the promises made under the Law. In this sense we acknowledge a *Real Presence* of Christ in the Sacrament. *Though we are convinced that our first Reformers judged right, concerning the use of the phrase Real Presence, that it were better to be let fall than to be continued, since the use of it, and that idea which does naturally arise from the common acceptation of it, may stick deeper, and feed superstition more, than all those larger explanations that are given to it can be able to cure. But howsoever in this sense it is innocent of itself, and may be law-*

[1] Ibid. pp. 386, 387.

[2] Ibid. pp. 388, 389.

fully used; though perhaps it were more cautiously done not to use it, since advantages have been taken from it to urge it farther than we intend it; and since it has been a snare to some." [1]

These remarks may show the Authors under review, how little entitled they are to assume, that the phrase *Real Presence* can only be used in the sense which they ascribe to it. But certainly the cautionary remarks of Bishop Burnet as to its use, and the consequences that may arise from it, could not have a better illustration of their truth and importance than in the case of Archdeacon Denison, who, ignorant of all the old controversies on the subject, and the different way in which the words have been used, has evidently been led blindfold by the mere phrase.

Bishop Burnet, in the course of his comment, notices the doctrine of the Fathers on the subject, and points out, among other evidences of its nature, that "They affirm that "Christ can be no more on earth, since he is now in heaven, "and that *he can be but in one place;*" and that "They say, "that which hath no bounds nor figure, and that can neither be "touched nor seen, *cannot be a body:* that bodies are extended "in some place, and *cannot exist after the manner of spirits.*" [2]

The Bishop then points out, at some length, the doctrine of the Fathers, and shows that it is entirely opposed to the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and he then proceeds to notice the doctrine of *Consubstantiation* in the following terms:—

"The Lutherans believe a *Consubstantiation*, and that both Christ's Body and Blood, and the substance of the elements, are together in the Sacrament. That some explain by an *ubiquity*, which they think is communicated to the human nature of Christ, by which his Body is everywhere as well as in the Sacrament:[3] whereas others of them think, that since the words of Christ must needs be true in a literal sense, his Body and Blood is therefore in the Sacrament, but *in, with*, and *under* the bread and wine. ALL THIS WE [i.e. we of the Church of England] THINK IS ILL GROUNDED, AND IS NEITHER AGREEABLE TO THE WORDS OF THE INSTITUTION, NOR TO THE NATURE OF THINGS. *A great deal of that which was formerly set forth in defence of our doctrine falls likewise upon this.* The ubiquity communicated to the human nature, as it seems *a thing*

[1] Ibid. p. 397. [2] Ibid. p. 407.

[3] It would have been more correct to have said, that it was by a power of multipresence given to Christ's Body through its union with the Divine nature.

in itself impossible, so it gives no more to the Sacrament than to everything else. Christ's Body may be said to be in everything, or rather everything may be said to be his Body and Blood, as well as the elements in the Sacrament. *The impossibility of a body's being without extension, or in more places at once, lies against this as well as against Transubstantiation.*" [1]

The Bishop then proceeds to remark, that notwithstanding the opposition of the doctrines both of Consubstantiation and Transubstantiation to the doctrine of our own Church, yet that so far as they alone in themselves are concerned, *if they do not lead to practical errors*, we may "*hold communion* with Bodies of men" that maintain them. I will give his words in a note below,[2] that I may not seem to keep out of sight anything that might appear to some to modify his testimony. But I must observe, that this is not a point now under consideration. Perhaps a mere *speculative* belief in such doctrines might not be a sufficient ground in itself for *refusing all communion with Churches that held it*. But that is a question which our Church has not expressly decided, and is a matter of private opinion.

And in the case before us, the doctrine of Consubstantiation *is* followed out into that very practical error which the Bishop notices as a decisive ground for even *refusing communion with any Church or Body of men that maintains it*, namely, *the adoration of the elements*. For after the remarks quoted in the note below, he adds,—

[1] Ibid. p. 426.

[2] "But yet after all this is only a point of speculation, nothing follows upon it in practice, no adoration is offered to the elements [i.e. such things do not *necessarily* follow, and many of the Lutherans do not carry out their doctrine thus far; but certainly some of their leading divines consider it to involve the propriety of such adoration]; and therefore we judge that speculative opinions may be borne with, when they neither fall upon the fundamentals of Christianity, to give us false ideas of the essential parts of our religion, nor affect our practice, and chiefly when the worship of God is maintained in its purity, for which we see God has expressed so particular a concern. . . . We can very well bear with some opinions that we think ill-grounded, as long as they are only matters of opinion, and have no influence neither on men's morals nor their worship. We still hold communion with Bodies of men, that as we judge think wrong, but yet do both live well and maintain the purity of the worship of God. . . And therefore we think that neither Consubstantiation nor Transubstantiation, how ill-grounded soever we take both to be, ought to dissolve the union and communion of Churches." (Ibid. pp. 426, 427.) That a minister of a Church which repudiates Consubstantiation should be allowed to teach that doctrine, is of course a totally different question.

"BUT IT IS QUITE ANOTHER THING IF UNDER EITHER OF THESE OPINIONS AN ADORATION OF THE ELEMENTS IS TAUGHT AND PRACTISED." [1]

Now this, as we have seen,[2] is expressly taught both by Archdeacon Denison and Archdeacon Wilberforce as well as by some at least of the Lutherans, and in fact *legitimately follows* from the doctrine of Consubstantiation as well as Transubstantiation.

No doubt the Authors under review, like the Romanists, would object to the phrase "adoration of the *elements*," on the ground that they do not worship the *elements* but the Body and Blood of Christ *in*, or *under the form of*, the elements. But this is a mere subterfuge. It is not meant by this phrase that they worship the substance of bread and wine, but that they fall down in worship before what is really only bread and wine, as if it contained in it or under its forms the real Body and Blood of Christ. And as Bishop Burnet justly observes,—

"We ought to consider this action as it is in itself, and not according to men's apprehensions and opinions about it. If the conceits that the ancient idolaters had both concerning their gods and the idols that they worshipped, will excuse from idolatry, it will be very hard to say that there were ever any idolaters in the world. *Those who worshipped the sun, thought that the great Divinity was lodged there,* AS IN A VEHICLE OR TEMPLE; *but yet they were not, by reason of that misconception, excused from being idolaters.* . . . . We know God by his essence is every where; but this will not justify our worshipping any material object upon this pretence, because God is in it; *we ought never to worship him* TOWARDS ANY VISIBLE OBJECT, unless he were evidently declaring his glory in it; as he did to Moses in the Flaming Bush; to the Israelites on Mount Sinai; and in the Cloud of Glory; or to us Christians in a sublimer manner in the human nature of Jesus Christ." [3]

On the 29th Article he makes the following remarks:—

"This Article arises naturally out of the former, and depends upon it; for, if Christ's Body is corporally present in the Sacrament, then all persons, good or bad, who receive the Sacrament, do also receive Christ: on the other hand, if Christ is present only

[1] Ibid. p. 427. [2] See pp. 55, &c. above. [3] Ibid. pp. 427, 428.

in a spiritual manner,[1] and if the mean that receives Christ is *faith*, then such as believe not, do not receive him. So that to prove that the wicked do not receive Christ's Body and Blood, is upon the matter the same thing with the proving that he is not corporally present. And it is a very considerable branch of our argument, by which we prove that the Fathers did not believe the corporal presence, because they do very often say, that the wicked do not receive Christ in the Sacrament. . . . . And as it is *confessed on all hands*, that the inward and spiritual effects of the Sacrament depend upon the state and disposition of him that communicates, so *we who own no other presence but an inward and spiritual one, cannot conceive that the wicked who believe not in Christ do receive him*." [2]

And having proceeded to give passages from several of the Fathers in confirmation of the truth of his statements, he adds,—

" More needs not be said concerning this, since it will be readily granted, that if we are in the right in the main point of denying the corporal presence, that this will fall with it." [3]

The next Commentary on the Articles that was published was one by Dr. W. Nicholls, which appeared in 1712. fol., but as it extended only to the first fifteen and part of the sixteenth, it did not embrace any that affect the subject before us.

The next work published on the XXXIX Articles was one containing Scriptural proofs and brief notes upon them, by the Rev. E. Welchman, in Latin, first published in 1713,[4] and frequently reprinted and referred to by subsequent writers.

The brevity of the notes prevents the testimony being so full and express as in a larger Commentary; but the following two passages, particularly the latter, clearly show the doctrine maintained.

[1] The reader will observe in what a different sense our older divines used this phrase from that in which Archdeacon Denison applies it. He interprets the phrase "in a spiritual manner" as if it meant, present in the bread and wine *in the form of a spirit*, and so misrepresents the views of the whole stream of our divines.

[2] Ibid. pp. 431, 432. [3] Ibid. p. 433.

[4] Its title is,—XXXIX Articuli Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ textibus e Sacra Scriptura depromptis confirmati, brevibusque notis illustrati &c. In usum Juventutis Academicæ. Auct. Edv. Welchman, Eccl. Anglic. Presbyt. Oxon. E theatro Sheldon. 1713. 8vo.

On the latter part of the 28th Article, he says,—

"Cum dicat Christus, Nisi manducaveritis &c., non habetis vitam. Jo. vi. 53: idemque dicat, Qui credit in me habet vitam æternam. ib. v. 47. patet, *medium quo manducatur esse fidem.*" [1]

On the 29th Article he says,—

"Articulus hic est prioris consectarium. Nam quum fides est medium manducationis sacramentalis, ut impii, quibus non est fides, Christi sint participes, impossibile est. SYMBOLA *vero accipientes* ad judicium accipiunt, et peccant in Christum res sacras indigne tractando." [2]

In the following year (i.e. 1714) appeared a work entitled "Directions for Studying, 1. A General System or Body of Divinity. 2. The XXXIX Articles of Religion," in 8vo. by the Rev. T. (afterwards Dr.) Bennet, Rector of St. James's in Colchester; a writer of considerable and general reputation in our Church.

His chief object seems to be, to point out the leading propositions contained in the Articles, and with very brief remarks on them to refer the reader to works where he will find the doctrine of our Church on the subject clearly set forth.

Now in his Comment on the 28th Article, after having given references to certain works in disproof of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he proceeds to refer, in disproof also of the doctrine of *Consubstantiation*, to the 28th Question of Turretin's *Locus Decimus Nonus*,[3] an author whose sentiments are wholly opposed to those of the Authors under review; and he adds a reference to our own Archbishop Wake's Commentary on the Catechism, sect. 49,[4] which is, as I shall presently show, most clear and express in its opposition to the notion of the real body of Christ being present so as to be eaten by the mouth of the communicants.

The next Commentary that appeared on the Articles was that by Bishop Beveridge, a posthumous work, which was first published in 1716 in fol. and 8vo., and embraced in that edition only the first thirty Articles, the remainder of the Commentary not

[1] p. 30. [2] p. 31.

[3] The work to which he refers is, F. Turretini Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ

[4] T. BENNET'S Directions for Studying, &c. (as given above) p. 137.

having come into the hands of the bookseller who published it. The book, however, has recently been printed at the University Press, Oxford (1840 and 1846, 8vo.) from "the original MS. in the Bishop's handwriting," including the Commentary on all the Thirty-nine Articles.[1] Bishop Beveridge's name needs no recommendation.

The following passages are from his comment on the words, "The body of Christ is given," &c. in the 28th Article.

"If the bread be not really changed into the body of Christ, then THE BODY OF CHRIST IS NOT REALLY THERE PRESENT; and if it be not really there present, it is impossible it should be really eaten and received into our bodies as bread is."[2]

And to prove "that the body and blood of Christ are not eaten after a corporal but only *a spiritual manner* in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper," &c. he adduces the following arguments,—

"First, it is impossible that that body which was but of the ordinary bulk with ours, should be sufficient, if eaten after a corporal manner, to feed and satisfy so many millions of millions of souls as have already and may hereafter eat of it. And secondly, suppose it was not impossible, yet it would be unprofitable for us thus to eat of the body of Christ. For our Saviour himself having preached concerning the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, the Jews and Capernaites taking him (as their followers the Papists do) in a carnal sense, cried out, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' (John vi. 52.) And his disciples themselves said, 'This is an hard saying, who can hear it?' (ver. 60.) Whereupon he explained himself, and told them, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.' (ver. 63.) As if he should have said, Though I do speak of eating my flesh, I would not have you think that my very flesh profiteth anything, or quickeneth; no, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing;' and the words that I speak unto you are not to be understood in a carnal, but a spiritual sense, for they are spirit and life; plainly showing that the corporal eating of his body is unprofitable, and that whatsoever he said concerning eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood was still to be understood in a heavenly

[1] The title is,—Ecclesia Anglicana Ecclesia Catholica; or, The Doctrine of the Church of England consonant to Scripture reason and Fathers: in a discourse upon the XXXIX Articles.
Ed. Oxf. 1846. 8vo. pp. 482, 483.

and spiritual sense. Thirdly, upon this supposition, that the body of Christ is corporally eaten in the sacrament, it follows that it was corporally broken too, and so that Christ did really break his own body, before the Jews broke it for him; yea, and that Christ *received his own body into his own body:* for that he received this sacrament himself, as well as administered [it] to his disciples, is plain, not only from the testimonies of the Fathers, but from the words of our Saviour himself: . . . So that I cannot see how it can possibly be denied, that Christ ate of the bread whereof he said, 'This is my body;' and if he ate it, and ate it corporally, that is, ate his very body as we eat bread, *then he ate himself, and* MADE ONE BODY TWO, *and then crowded them into one again, putting his body into his body, even his whole body into part of his body, his stomach: and so he must be thought not only to have* TWO BODIES, *but two bodies so as to be one within another; yea, so as to be one eaten and devoured by another; the absurdity of which and the like assertions he that hath but half an eye may easily discover.* So that it must needs be granted to be in a spiritual manner that this sacrament was then instituted, and by consequence that it is in a spiritual manner that this sacrament ought now to be received."——"And it being thus only after a spiritual manner that we receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, there can be no other means whereby we can receive him but faith."—"So that it is *faith whereby we feed upon the body and blood of Christ*, and therefore it is not carnally but *spiritually that we receive it.*"[1]

The greater portion of these remarks applies quite as much to the doctrine of the Authors under review as to that of Transubstantiation.

Again, on the 29th Article he speaks thus clearly and expressly:—

"It being not after a carnal but spiritual manner only, as we have seen in the foregoing Article, that the body and blood of Christ are eaten and drunken in the sacrament, *it must needs be a spiritual person, not a carnal, that can eat and drink it.* For though a spiritual person may do some things carnally, yet a carnal person can never do any thing spiritually. And therefore, though godly and spiritual men may feed upon the body and blood of Christ out of the sacrament as well as in it, yet wicked and carnal men *miss of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament as well as out of it.* They may indeed eat the bread which signifies the Lord, but they

[1] Ibid. pp. 483—486.

cannot feed upon the Lord, which is signified by the bread. They may take down the bread and wine into their bodies, but not receive the body and blood of Christ into their souls. And truly we need not go far to prove this, even *that wicked men do not eat the body and blood of Christ;* for if they eat the body and blood of Christ, they are not wicked men, but such as dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them; as Christ himself assures us, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' (John vi. 56.) He that dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him, can be no wicked man: but he that eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ, dwells in Christ, and hath Christ dwelling in him, and therefore cannot possibly be a wicked man. And if he that eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ can be no wicked man, it must needs follow, that no wicked man can eat and drink the body and blood of Christ." [1]

No words could more clearly express the doctrine, that to eat and drink the body and blood of Christ is altogether a spiritual act, an act of the soul, and one which a wicked person cannot do, inasmuch as he wants that faith by which the act is performed; and consequently that there is no such presence of the body and blood of Christ in or under the elements, as that they are eaten and drunk by the mouth of the body.

The next Commentary on the Articles was one by the Rev. Ralph Ford, the title of which I give below, [2] consisting of a careful analysis of the Articles, and remarks illustrative of the doctrine maintained in them, compiled principally from the Fathers and modern divines of note. Among the subscribers to this work will be found the names of the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin, and the Bishops of St. Asaph, Bath and Wells, Bangor, Carlisle, Chichester, Derry, Ely, Exeter, Gloucester, London, Lincoln, Lichfield and Coventry, Llandaff, Norwich, Peterborough, Rochester, Salisbury, Worcester; and it is dedicated to the King. So that it certainly appeared under the highest auspices when it was first published.

The following passages are from his Commentary on Art. 28.:—

"'Hoc est corpus meum,' tum *Pontificii*, tum *Ubiquitarii*, *non*

[1] Ibid. pp. 491, 492.

[2] Christianæ Religionis, sive Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Articuli XXXIX. perspicua analysi breviter explicati, &c. &c. a RAN. FORD, Eccles. Angl. Presb. &c. Lond. 1720. 8vo.

figurate, sed proprie volunt accipi. Pontificii dum vi consecrationis fieri statuunt μετουσίαν transubstantiationem elementorum in carnem et sanguinem Christi; ideoque pronomine 'Hoc' non intelligunt (ut supra in effectu dixerim) panem nec corpus, sed substantiam vagam, q. d. eatenus cum Ubiquitariis contentum sub speciebus panis et vini. Ubiquitarii enim συνουσίαν (differentiam demonstrare) CONSUBSTANTIATIONEM *asserunt, seu* COEXISTENTIAM *corporis et sanguinis in, cum, et sub pane et vino, penetrationem dimensionum admittentes. Utrique gloriantur se τὸ ῥητὸν retinere. Statuuntque oralem manducationem,* Pontificii etiam adorationem. Nos verborum formam sacramentalem ita resolvendam esse asserimus,—Panis et vinum sunt *signa et sigilla corporis et sanguinis Christi. Realem præsentiam* in sacra cœna SANO SENSU intellectam non negamus, corpus enim et sanguis Christi cum pane et vino uniuntur *unione pactionali, seu relativa, non autem corporaliter et localiter* sub speciebus tanquam unicum earum suppositum sive subjectum, etiam extra usum, idque donec species intereant, ut docent Pontificii; nam IN SACRAMENTIS RES SIGNIFICATÆ NON SOLENT IN SIGNIS DELITESCERE, SED PER EA SIGNIFICARI ET OBSIGNARI; Gen xvii. Exod. xii. 1 Cor. x. 16." [1]

Here we see that the notion that the words "This is my body" are to be understood "*not figuratively, but literally,*" is considered as peculiar to the Papists and Ubiquitaries, or those who hold the doctrine of Consubstantiation, or the co-existence of Christ's body and blood in, with, or under the bread and wine; and the doctrine of the Church of England is expressly distinguished from that of *both* those parties; and it is maintained, that "in sacraments the things signified do not lie hid in the signs, but are signified and sealed by them."

Again, he says,—

"In prima cœna Christus assedit apostolis visibiliter, panem fregit, vinum fudit, ipse etiam comedit et bibit. *Merito delirare videantur,* qui credunt Christum tunc invisibiliter sub speciebus illis delituisse, corpus suum fregisse, sanguinem effudisse, et semetipsum comedisse et bibisse." [2]

"*In sacramentis symbola sive signa percipiuntur corporaliter, signatum spiritualiter;* at si manducatio sit oralis, nec signum est; quia aliud quid non significatur; nec signatum, quia non est quid spirituale." [3]

[1] pp. 270, 271. [2] p. 271. [3] p. 271.

"Corporalis comestio Christi, tum in cœna, tum extra cœnam, tanquam inutilis et absurda rejicitur, Jo. vi. 63." [1]

"Patres eundem comederunt cibum spiritualem, 1 Cor. x. 3. non tantum inter se, sed *nobiscum;* at *illi comederunt per fidem (corpus et sanguis Christi nondum erant);* scopus enim Apostoli est, probare fideles V. Testamenti Corinthiis fuisse nequaquam inferiores, quoad substantiam fœderis." [2]

"Ecclesia ad 6. sæculum *nec corporalem præsentiam* NEC ORALEM MANDUCATIONEM *defendit;* Patres autem docent panem et vinum in Eucharistia esse *signa, symbola, figuras* et *mnemosyna* corporis et sanguinis Christi." [3]

"Ex verbis nostri B. Mediatoris, Jo. vi. 56. constat, quod nihil nisi interna et spiritualis manducatio per illa significatur." [4]

"Constat quod Eucharistia non est adoranda, nam (1) Nullibi adorare jubetur. (2) Nuspiam legimus apostolos adorasse Eucharistiam. (3) *Quia corpus Christi non est in Eucharistia.* (4) Quia vetus Ecclesia nunquam Eucharistiam adorari debere censuit. Sed *Christum adorare* IN CŒLIS *debemus.*" [5]

And he quotes among his notes on this Article the passage from Nowell's Catechism, which I shall presently cite; and also the interpretation of Elis, a portion of which has just been quoted.

The following passages occur in his Commentary on Art. 29:—

"Ut viderimus in Articulo immediate præcedenti, Corpus et Sanguinem Christi non carnaliter sed spiritualiter in Sacramento manducari et bibi; sequitur, *personam spiritualem et non carnalem ex illo participem non posse.* Quia, licet persona spiritualis carnaliter aliquid faciat, tamen *persona carnalis nunquam aliquid facere potest spiritualiter.*" [6]

And he proceeds to quote the passage just cited from the notes of Welchman on this Article.[7]

"INDIGNE ACCEDENTES NON REM SIGNATAM RECIPIUNT, *nam manducare Christum est participes fieri Christi et beneficiorum ejus,* Jo. vi. 35. Dec. Fogg. de S. Cœna, p. 320. Q. Si fiunt rei corporis et sanguinis Christi, tum corpus illius edunt et sanguinem bibunt, quamvis indigne. *Sol.* Rei fiunt qui *panem indigne manducant sine Christo,* sicut qui violant sigillatum, indulgentiæ regiæ diploma rei fiunt; recipiunt, sed in ipsorum judicium, 1 Cor. xi. 32. *Ibid.*" [8]

"Ille qui habitat in Christo, habetque Christum habitantem in seipso, non hominem impium existimare debemus; sed qui manducat

[1] p. 272. [2] p. 272. [3] p. 272. [4] p. 273. [5] p. 279.
[6] p. 288. [7] p. 288. [8] p. 289.

et bibit corpus et sanguinem Christi, habitat in Christo, habetque Christum habitantem in seipso, et ergo non malus esse potest. Et si ille qui manducat et bibit corpus et sanguinem Christi, non impius homo sit, sequitur, quod nullus malus edere vel bibere potest corpus et sanguinem Christi." [1]

And he proceeds to quote the passages already cited from the comment of Elis on this Article.

The next work published on the Articles was one entitled "An Exposition of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England, founded on the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers of the three first centuries," by the Rev. J. Veneer, Rector of St. Andrew's in Chichester; of which the second and a much enlarged edition appeared, Lond. 1734. 2 vols. 8vo.

Mr. Veneer does not enter largely on the subject before us, and treats it with reference more particularly to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But he clearly shows his opposition to such doctrine as that of the Authors under review. He points out that the Fathers "say, that the names of the things signified are given to the signs;" [2] and to show how we are to understand the phrase of eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, he quotes Augustine's remark, (occurring in his De Doct. Christ. lib. iii. c. 16.) that such expressions are to be considered as *figurative*.[3] And he remarks,—"The mean whereby the body of Christ "is received and eaten in the Lord's Supper is faith. For since "our Saviour hath said, John vi. 53, 'Except ye eat the flesh of "the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you:' "and since he saith, verse 47, that 'he that believeth on him, "hath everlasting life,' it is manifest that faith is the mean "whereby the Body of Christ is eaten." [4]

And on Art. 29, he says,—"This Article is an inference or "deduction from the former. For since a lively faith is the "mean whereby we eat the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper, "it follows, that wicked men, who have not this faith, cannot "possibly be partakers of Christ. . . . That such wicked men as "receive *the sacramental bread and wine* eat and drink condem- "nation or judgment to themselves, and sin against Christ, by "using such things as are holy in an unworthy manner, hath

p. 289. [2] On Art. xxviii. vol. 2. p. 660. [3] Ibid. p. 662. [4] Ibid. p. 663

"been already proved from 1 Cor. xi. 29, under the XXVth "Article."[1]

And he urges against the doctrine of Transubstantiation the consideration that if it were true, "no reason can be assigned why wicked men, and even mice, may not *eat the Body of Christ*;"[2] an objection which, confessedly, equally applies to the doctrine of the Authors under review.

These, as far as I am aware, are *all* the Commentaries which were published on the Articles during the first two centuries after their final settlement in 1571.

But as the Authors under review are exceedingly fond of assailing their opponents in this matter with the opprobrious charge of *Calvinism*, and maintaining that all who deny the literal meaning of the words of institution are Zuinglians or Calvinists, I will refer to one more Commentary on the Articles of some repute in our Church, of a later date, namely, that by Dr. Pretyman, (afterwards Tomline) Bishop of Lincoln, the chief modern opponent of Calvinism in our Church, and author of the well-known work entitled, "A Refutation of Calvinism," first published in 1811.

His Commentary on the Articles was first published in 1799, forming the second volume of his work entitled, "Elements of Christian Theology."

In his comment on the 28th Article, after saying that "the bread broken was to represent his body offered upon the cross, and the wine poured out was to represent his blood, which was shed for the salvation of men,"[3] and that the bread and wine are "typical representations of the body and blood of Christ,"[4] he observes,—

"The idea of Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist was first started in the beginning of the eighth century, and it owed its rise to the indiscretion of preachers and writers of warm imaginations, who, *instead of explaining judiciously the lofty figures of Scripture language upon this subject, understood and urged them in their literal sense. Thus the true meaning of these expressions was* GROSSLY PERVERTED; but as this conceit seemed to exalt the nature of the holy sacrament, it was eagerly received in that ignorant and

[1] Ibid. pp. 664, 665. [2] Ibid. p. 665. [3] Vol. 2. p. 476. ed. 1799.
[4] Ibid. p. 477.

superstitious age; and when once introduced, it soon spread, and was *by degrees carried farther and farther*, by persons still less guarded in their application of these metaphorical phrases, till *at length*, in the twelfth century, the actual change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ by the consecration of the priest, was pronounced to be a Gospel truth, by the pretended authority of the Church of Rome." [1]

"Luther, in contradiction to the other Reformers, *only changed Transubstantiation into Consubstantiation*, which means that the substance of Christ's Body and Blood is present in the Holy Sacrament with the substance of bread and wine; and his perseverance in this opinion was a principal cause of the division among the Reformed Churches." [2]

"The bread and wine must have been considered by them [i.e. the Apostles] as symbolical; and indeed *the whole transaction was* EVIDENTLY FIGURATIVE IN ALL ITS PARTS." [3]

"As the occasion was *typical*, so likewise were the words used by our Saviour: 'This is my body which is broken, and this is my blood which is shed.' But his body was not yet broken, nor was his blood yet shed; and therefore the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine, were then figurative of what was about to happen, as they are *now figurative of what has actually happened*." [4]

"Since then the words, 'This is my Body and this is my Blood,' upon which the Papists pretend to support this doctrine, were MANIFESTLY USED IN A FIGURATIVE SENSE, and must have been so understood by the Apostles to whom they were originally addressed, we may safely pronounce that Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ." [5]

"That the early Christians understood our Saviour's words *in a figurative sense*, appears from the writings of more than twenty Fathers, without a single authority on the opposite side." [6]

On the words, "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only in a heavenly and spiritual manner," &c., he observes,—

"This part of the Article is evidently the consequence of what

[1] Ibid. p. 480. [2] Ibid. p. 481. [3] Ibid. p. 483.
[4] Ibid. p. 483. [5] Ibid. p. 484.
[6] Ibid. p. 484. The reader may compare with this the language of Archdeacon Denison as referred to p. 590 above.

has been already proved. Since the body of Christ is *not actually present in the Eucharist*, we can only eat it spiritually. Those that come duly prepared to this holy sacrament, and receive it rightly and worthily, are spiritually partakers of his Body and Blood; 'they become one with Christ, and Christ with them;' and they really and truly partake of the benefits of his passion as living members of his Body; as he is the bread of life, they are there nourished, strengthened and supported by him; they *receive him by faith; by faith they feed upon him;* and the divine life, which is thus begun in their souls is in a spiritual manner upheld and carried on in them: 'Whoso eateth my flesh,' &c. (John vi. 54, 55.) *Thus, instead of maintaining the groundless doctrine of the corporal presence of the Body and Blood, of the flesh and bones of Christ, which is contradicted by our senses, is* EQUALLY IRRECONCILEABLE WITH REASON AND SCRIPTURE, *and was unknown in the Christian Church for the first seven centuries, we own a real spiritual presence of him who is the way, the truth, and the life; and profess our belief, that while we worthily partake of the appointed* EMBLEMS *of his Body and Blood, an inward grace is communicated, which purifies our hearts, fortifies our minds against the temptations of the world, and animates our efforts 'in pressing towards the mark,'* &c. (Phil. iii. 14.)"[1]

Moreover, on the 29th Article the Bishop says,—

"If with the Church of Rome we believed the actual presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, then all persons, good and bad, who received the sacrament, would equally receive the body of Christ. But we have shown in the preceding Article, that he is present only in a spiritual manner, and that 'the mean, whereby the Body

[1] Ibid. pp. 488, 489. This decisive expression of the Bishop's views of the meaning of the Article shows, that when, in one part of his Commentary on it, (p. 482) he said that the part of the Article of 1552 left out in the revision of 1562 was omitted "probably with a view to give *less offence* to those who maintained the corporal presence, and to comprehend as many as possible in the Established Church," he did not mean that the words substituted did not in reality exclude that doctrine. He probably meant the same as Bishop Burnet did in the words quoted from him pp. 670, 671 above. And the 29th Article, which, though subscribed by Convocation in 1562, was omitted in the printed edition, probably for the same reason, was, in the revision of 1571, when a more open and decided stand was made against the Romanists, re-inserted, and appeared among the Articles sanctioned by Royal authority. And, as I have before observed, so far as we now are concerned, the re-introduction of the rubric of the Prayer-Book of 1552 (with slight alterations) into our present Prayer-Book at the revision in 1662, would alone place the matter with us on its previous footing.

of Christ is received and eaten, is faith:' consequently, they who have not faith, do not receive Christ."—"The doctrine of this Article is clearly asserted in the antient Fathers;[1]

And this he proceeds to prove by passages from their writings.

With these testimonies I am satisfied to leave the question of the true meaning of the Articles in the hands of the reader; and to commit to his judgment *the character of the attempt made by the Authors under review to wrest them in favor of their own views.*

SECTION IV.

Testimony of the Catechism.

The fourth and last document in our authorised Formularies which remains to be considered, is *the Catechism.*

Here, as I have done before, I would first remind the reader what its testimony is.

Let us observe, first, its definition of the word "sacrament:" —"Q. What meanest thou by this word *sacrament?* A. I "mean AN OUTWARD AND VISIBLE SIGN *of an inward and spi-* "*ritual grace* given unto us, ordained by Christ himself as a "means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us "thereof."

Such, then, is the proper meaning of the word *sacrament.* It refers to the water and bread and wine used in Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which *after consecration* become *sacraments.* And therefore, when this word is applied *to the consecrated elements,* this definition of the Catechism shows us what our Church means by it; and consequently what the phrase "sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" signifies, we cannot doubt; namely, "the outward and visible sign" of the Body and Blood of Christ.

But though this is the strict and proper meaning of the word, it is sometimes used as denoting *the whole rite* in which those sacraments are ministered; and in this sense there are, as the Catechism tells us, two sacraments, namely Baptism and the

[1] Ibid. pp. 491—493.

Supper of the Lord; and of a sacrament, in this meaning of the word, there are, of course, according to the definition of the Catechism, *two parts*, "the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace."

Now of these two parts, one only is given by man, and the other is given by God; and the former is given visibly and sensibly, the latter is given invisibly and not with the cognizance of the outward senses.

And he who has received the outward part given by man, has received the sacrament in the proper sense of the word, as "the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace," though he may not have received the Thing signified, or *res sacramenti*.

The word *sacrament*, therefore, is used in the Catechism, as in most theological works, in two different senses, and it is essential that we keep this in view when reasoning upon its statements. To confound together these two uses of the word, and apply the word when used in one sense with the meaning that belongs to it when used in the other, as Archdeacon Denison has done, is merely to throw dust into the eyes of the reader. On this double use of the word I have already, more than once in the course of this work, made some observations, to which, therefore, I would here refer the reader.

There is also another passage in the Catechism which distinctly negatives the doctrine that all communicants indiscriminately receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, namely, in the answer to the question, "What is the inward part or thing signified?"—which stands thus:—"The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received *by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper."

Who they are that alone receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is here plainly intimated, namely, "*the faithful.*" This alone is sufficient for the condemnation of the doctrine of Archdeacons Denison and Wilberforce.

And it must be observed, that the language here used differs in another important respect from that adopted by all the three Authors whose works I am here controverting. The Body and Blood of Christ are received, we are here told, "*in the Lord's Supper.*" This is very different language from that which they

use. The difference between holding the Real Presence *in the Lord's Supper*, and the Real Presence in or under the consecrated Bread and Wine — the eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ by *the faithful in the Lord's Supper*, and the eating and drinking of that Body and Blood by *all, as in or under the consecrated Bread and Wine*—is immense and full of important consequences. There is to *the faithful* a Real, though not substantial, Presence of Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper, and a true spiritual eating and drinking of His Body and Blood: not because the elements are made by consecration to include within themselves, either locally or superlocally or spiritually or supernaturally, or in any other way which men may like to imagine, a Real substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, for then *the wicked* would be partakers of the same; but because *the faithful*, in receiving the consecrated elements, do, through faith on their part and a gracious gift on Christ's part, become, in a spiritual way, partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ.

And for the meaning of our Church in this passage, so far as concerns *the way* in which the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed received by the faithful," we must refer to the Formulary in which she has more fully and distinctly expressed her doctrine, namely, the XXXIX Articles, in which it is declared that "the body of Christ is given taken and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."[1]

And, in fact, the statement that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received" is not reconcileable with the doctrine of the Authors under review. For, whatever *words* they may choose to use on the subject, according to their doctrine the *true* Body and Blood of Christ are *not* really taken and received. For what they put forward as the Body and Blood of Christ are not such, but a mere Marcionite phantasm, an immaterial thing, the creature of their own imagination. They dare not venture to assert, that the Body and Blood of Christ are present in their true material form, though they admit that it is in that form that they exist in heaven.

[1] Art. xxviii.

And having thus turned the Body and Blood of Christ into an immaterial spirit, they maintain that we eat and drink in a bodily way with our mouth this immaterial spirit; which, nevertheless, with marvellous self-contradiction, they maintain to be the very substantial body and blood that suffered upon the cross!

But if we take the words *Body and Blood of Christ* in their proper sense, then the statement, that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received," can be understood but in one way, that is, that they are so taken and received *by the soul in a spiritual manner*. And this is the manner in which our Church tells us, in her 28th Article, that they are received. And the divines of the sixteenth century who held this view, were very careful to express themselves in the strongest terms as to the *reality* of this reception, and to point out that it was quite as true and real a reception, and far more so, for all spiritual purposes, than a reception by the mouth could be. And it is only from the too prevalent want of knowledge of the phraseology in use at that period, that these words of our Catechism have ever created a difficulty or suggested a doubt as to the doctrine of our Church on the subject. Thus Archbishop Cranmer says,—"I say that Christ giveth himself truly to be eaten, chewed, and digested; but all is *spiritually, with faith, not with mouth.*"[1] And again he admits that Christ's "true, natural and organical flesh is given us to be eaten;" but then against the Romanist who says, "Therefore we eat it with our mouth," he adds,—"I deny it. We eat it through faith."[2]

And so Bishop Jewel says, "*The body then which we eat is in heaven*, above all angels and archangels and powers and principalities. Our meat is in heaven on high; and we are here below on the earth. How may it be that we may reach it, or taste, or eat it? . . . By the hand of faith we reach unto him, and *by the mouth of faith we receive his body.*"[3] "They [i.e. the Fathers] teach us plainly, that the spiritual eating of Christ's body by faith is *the true eating.*"[4] "That we *verily*

[1] See p. 5 above.

[2] See p. 6 above. It will be observed, that the Romanist who pressed this question upon Cranmer, was going beyond that doctrine which was *afterwards* established as the doctrine of his Church at the Council of Trent.

[3] JEWEL'S Treat. of the Sacraments. Works, P. S. ed. vol. 2. pp. 1118, 1119.

[4] Ibid. p. 1120.

" *and undoubtedly receive Christ's Body* in the Sacrament, it is " neither denied, nor in question. St. Augustine saith: *Panis est* " *cordis . . . intus esuri, intus siti:* 'It is the bread of the heart: " hunger thou within; thirst thou within.' And THE THING " THAT IS INWARDLY RECEIVED IN FAITH, AND IN SPIRIT, IS " RECEIVED VERILY AND INDEED." . . . " It is a holy mystery, " and a heavenly action, forcing our minds up into heaven, and " *there* teaching us to eat the body of Christ and to drink his " blood; not outwardly by the service of our bodies, but *in-* " *wardly by our faith, and that* VERILY AND INDEED. The truth " hereof standeth not in any *real or corporal presence*, but, as " Hilarius saith, in a mystery, which is, in a sacrament: " whereby outwardly and unto our senses we express that thing " in our bodies that must be wrought inwardly in our minds." . . . . " Thus are we truly washed with Christ's blood in the " holy mystery of baptism: thus are we *truly and indeed fed* " *with Christ's body* in the holy mystery of his Supper.[1] " Thus " *by faith we eat the body of Christ*, and that not by way of " imagination or fantasy, but *effectually, verily and indeed;* and " therefore Christ shall raise us up again at the last day."[2]

And the words from which these words of our present Catechism are abridged, are a further illustration of the sense in which they were used. For, the second portion of our present Catechism (which was added shortly after the Hampton Court Conference in 1604) is evidently an abridgment of the latter part of Dean Nowell's third or smallest Catechism, (as will appear on collation) in which the answer corresponding to the one we are now considering in our present Catechism is as follows:—

" The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are given to the faithful, and by them taken eaten and drunk, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, yet nevertheless *verily in truth*, (cœlesti tantum spiritualique modo, *revera tamen*): so, that is, that like as the bread nourishes our bodies, thus also the body of Christ nourishes our souls spiritually through faith; and like as the hearts of men are exhilarated by wine and their strength confirmed, so our souls are refreshed and renewed by the blood of Christ through

[1] JEWEL, Reply to Harding, Art. 5. div. 10. Works P. S. ed. vol. 1. pp. 475, 476.

[2] Id. ibid. art. 8. div. 16. ibid. p. 529.

faith; in which way the body and blood of Christ are received in the Supper. For Christ as certainly makes those who trust in him partakers of his body and blood, as they certainly know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach." [1]

This answer, it will be observed, gives in *one* what is broken into *two* in our present Catechism.

I now proceed to a consideration of the arguments derived from this Formulary by the writers under review; beginning with Archdeacon Denison.

His first is taken from the answer to the second question, which, he says, "declares explicitly, that, in Holy Baptism, the "person baptized is 'made a member of Christ, the child of God, "and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven;'" and as the essentials of Baptism are "the water and the words," therefore "every person to whom the water and the words are applied is 'made' therein—i.e. in and by such application—'a member of Christ, &c.';" and "this portion of the Catechism is as exactly applicable to the case of *adults* as to that of *infants*." [2]

I quite agree with the Archdeacon as to the application of this portion of the Catechism to *adults* as well as *infants;* and without going further now into the Baptismal controversy, I will just observe, that this fact shows, that the words he refers to are certainly *not* to be taken in the absolute sense for which he contends; and there are so few that agree with the Archdeacon in his notion, that adults, coming to baptism in a state of vice and hypocrisy, necessarily receive in that ordinance the gift of spiritual regeneration, that it is not worth while now to enter further on that point, as it has but an indirect bearing upon the question before us.

But, adds the Archdeacon very reasonably,—"How is this concerned, it may be asked, with the doctrine of the Real Presence?" And his answer is this,—"It is very nearly concerned "with it indeed, because the doctrine of the Sacraments is ONE; "and when the Church declares that a GIFT is given in Holy "Baptism to each and every one of the baptized, it is all one "with declaring that a GIFT is given in Holy Communion to "each and every communicant." [3]

[1] NOWELLI Catechismus Parvus Pueris. Primum Latine qui ediscatur proponendus in scholis. ed. Lond. 1601. sm. 8vo.

[2] Serm. 2. p. 126; 3rd ed. p. 86. [3] Serm. 2. p. 127; 3rd ed. p. 86.

Now, even supposing that this argument from analogy was a correct one (which it is hardly necessary for us to discuss) how does this prove the Archdeacon's doctrine of the Real Presence? It seems to me to tell in the opposite direction; for, as the gift is given in baptism, though the thing signified by the water is *not* joined to the water, so, it may be argued, is the gift given in the Lord's Supper, though the things signified by the Bread and Wine are not joined to the Bread and Wine. And in this argument from analogy there is, I humbly conceive, some force.

So that at any rate the Archdeacon's argument fails in proving that the gift is given in the Bread and Wine.

But does it prove that the gift is in any way universally given? The argument is, that as even hypocrites coming to Baptism necessarily receive in that rite the gift of spiritual regeneration, so in the Lord's Supper all must receive the Body and Blood of Christ. I shall content myself at present with requesting the Archdeacon to prove the truth of the position from which he draws this conclusion, that is, that hypocrites *do* receive such a gift.

And there is another reason why his argument altogether fails. For, to make good the analogy, he ought to hold, that as all receive the grace of Baptism, so all receive the grace of the Eucharist. But this he does not hold. For he maintains that our Catechism (following, as he says, Augustine) makes these distinctions, "1. Sacramentum—'outward part or sign.' 2. Res "Sacramenti—'inward part or thing signified.' 3. Virtus or "Gratia Sacramenti—'benefits whereof we are partakers there-"by.'"[1] And while he maintains that the wicked receive the second of these, he does not hold that they receive the third. And what he here speaks of as a third part is, as I have already pointed out,[2] the second of the two parts of which the sacramental rite is, according to our Catechism, composed.

The fact is, that our Catechism does precisely what Archdeacon Wilberforce blames Augustine for doing[3]—it speaks as if it was all one to call the inward part the *res sacramenti* or the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti;* showing that the doctrine of those who composed it was, that the enjoyment of the *gratia sacramenti* neces-

[1] Serm. 2. p. 124; 3rd ed. p. 84. [2] See pp. 186 et seq. above.
[3] See p. 189 above.

sarily followed from the reception of the *res sacramenti*, and therefore that where *the grace* was not enjoyed, *the thing signified* was not received.

The Archdeacon proceeds to notice the words I have quoted above from the Catechism, namely, that the Body and Blood of Christ "are verily and indeed taken and received *by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper," which, he justly thinks, require some explanation at his hands; and accordingly, putting a bold face upon the difficulty, he coolly remarks, that though this is said, yet "it *is not* said that the Body and Blood of Christ *are not* verily and indeed taken and received by the *unfaithful* in the Lord's Supper,"[1] and therefore, adds the Archdeacon, "*it does not touch my proposition.*"[2]

That the Catechism lays it down that the Body and Blood of Christ are received by *the faithful*, does not at all prove, the Archdeacon thinks, that the Catechism did not mean that they are received just as much by every body else as by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. And so, therefore, we may argue, that when it tells us the privileges of the baptized, it does not by any means follow that it does not hold that all the *un*baptized enjoy just *the same* privileges. And if time was not of value, we might add several other illustrations of the force and application of the argument. But on such a statement it is needless to dilate.

But the Archdeacon endeavours to raise one argument more out of the Catechism. He says,—"The later portion of the "Catechism, following the distinctions elaborated by the School-"men out of the suggestion of S. Augustine, teaches that the "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has two parts, 1. the outward "visible part or sign. 2. the inward part or thing signified; "and that 'the inward part or thing signified,' is 'the Body and "Blood of Christ.' Wherefore all who receive the sacrament "of the Lord's Supper receive the Body and Blood of Christ. "If any do not, then, in their case, a sacrament is not a sacra-"ment."[3]

But the Archdeacon has here forgotten what he himself said only a few pages before, that among the "distinctions" "elaborated by divines who succeeded Augustine," and "stated in

[1] Serm. 2. p. 129; 3rd ed. p. 87. [2] Ib. p. 130; 3rd ed. p. 88.
[3] Ib. pp. 130, 131; 3rd ed. pp. 88, 89.

our own Catechism," the first was "Sacramentum—outward part or sign." [1] Which statement does he intend to abide by?

I need hardly observe, that the argument is founded upon a want of attention to the fact of the double meaning of the word sacrament, as used sometimes to designate *the rite*, and sometimes *the consecrated elements* used in the rite; which double meaning is expressly recognized in the Catechism; and I have alluded to this so frequently before that it can hardly be necessary to add anything more here to meet this argument.[2]

I pass on to Archdeacon Wilberforce's references to this Formulary.[3]

His argument from the Sacrament consisting of two parts, I have already noticed. But his main argument is this, that we are told that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," and then afterwards it is stated, what *the benefits* are of which we become partakers by *this reception;* showing, he contends, that beyond the reception of certain benefits, there is, besides, the reception of *a thing* from which those benefits flow; and he reasons as if this proved that the Body and Blood of Christ must be in the elements.

But the conclusion does not follow from the premises. No doubt there is a reception *by the soul* of the Body of Christ. And the consequence of that reception is, the enjoyment of certain benefits by the soul, namely, (as described in the Catechism) its being strengthened and refreshed by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine. But this does not prove a reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the mouth in conjunction with the elements. Nay, by the Archdeacon's own confession, that reception by the soul from which its enjoyment of spiritual benefits arises, does not necessarily follow from a reception of the Body and Blood of Christ (even if they were received) by the mouth, but is a separate and distinct act of the soul.

And the Catechism, so far from drawing this distinction between receiving the body of Christ and receiving the benefits derivable from it, remarkably connects (I had almost said, iden-

[1] Serm. 2. p. 124; 3rd ed. p. 84. [2] See pp. 629, 630, above.
[3] See his "Charge," pp. 285—8.

tifies) the two. For in two previous answers it makes the second part of a sacrament, and the inward thing signified by the outward element, to be, an "inward spiritual grace;" not the *res sacramenti*, but the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti*.

The Body and Blood of Christ are, no doubt, "verily and indeed" received, but they are so received by *the soul*, and not by the body; as Bishop Jewel points out in the passages just quoted, and numberless others which might be added; and as our Church clearly maintains, when she says in the 28th Article, that "*the mean* whereby they are received and eaten is *faith*."

The Archdeacon says,[1] that "the exact meaning" of the phrase *Real Presence* "is often mistaken," and that "a *real* presence means the presence of a *res* or thing, as distinguished either from the sign which represents, or the influence which emanates from it."

He means, that is, that to constitute a real presence there must be the *local* presence of *the substance* of a thing. No doubt he repudiates the use of the *word* "*local*," and thereby contrives to mystify the matter; but the presence he maintains is such that the thing spoken of is *on the communion table* and *in our mouths*; and therefore the reader may judge whether or not it is a *local* presence.

But he must recollect, that this is merely an arbitrary definition of his own, differing from the sense which many other writers attach to the phrase. That *he* uses it in this sense is perfectly true, and that others also do so. But that fact proves nothing. And "the mistake" is his own, in limiting the phrase to one meaning, when it is notoriously used in two senses. Such allegations merely tend to throw dust into the eyes of the reader. There is a real presence of the sun to us when we are warmed by its rays and cheered by its light; just *as real* as if its substance touched our bodies.

Before I pass on, it may be well to point out here, as in the case of the Articles, what is the interpretation given to the words of the Catechism in the most noted Expositions of it that have been published since its last revision and settlement in its present state in 1604. In the case of the Articles, it seemed desirable to notice *all* the Expositions that had been published for

[1] Charge, p. 288.

the first two centuries after; but here a selection is all that can be required, and is almost unavoidable from the number that have been published for the use of children. But the selection that I shall make will include all those that I am acquainted with that can be considered by any one as having a claim for consideration in such a point.

I begin with that of *Dr. Mayer*,[1] which appears to be the earliest Exposition of the Catechism in its present form. It was first published about the year 1622, 4to. A second and revised edition was published shortly after. A third and fourth edition (reprints of the second) appeared in 1623 and 1630 respectively. A fifth and further revised edition appeared in 1635. The last three editions (and probably the earlier ones also, which I have not seen) are stated in the title page to be "published by command," and have the Royal arms prefixed, showing that they had received the highest sanction. The fifth edition, it will be observed, appeared after the accession of Archbishop Laud to the Primacy, and the severity of his censorship of the press is well known; and therefore what was "published by command" under his sanction, cannot certainly be accused of being a Zuinglian misrepresentation of the doctrine of our Church. And as I have formerly pointed out in another work,[2] it does happen, that the alterations in this edition carry the view of the effects of Infant Baptism much higher than the statements in the previous editions. And in the remarks on the Lord's Supper, one passage is *added* in this edition (as I shall presently point out) of a somewhat peculiar character; but with this exception the statements of the previous editions remain, so far as their doctrine is concerned, unchanged; and I shall now give the reader a few brief quotations from them, taken from the fifth edition.

From his reasons against Transubstantiation, in his remarks on the question, "What is the outward sign or part of the Lord's Supper?" I select the two following, applying with precisely the same force against every doctrine involving the

[1] The English Catechism Explained; or, a Commentary on the Short Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

[2] The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants. 2nd ed. 1850. 8vo. pp. 471, 472.

notion of such a presence as the Authors under review advocate :—

"First, because that, grant it were the very body of Christ, his flesh and bones, what would this avail our souls? the Lord himself having taught us, 'that the flesh profiteth nothing,' speaking of his own flesh, if they should eat it with their teeth: for all things that are eaten, as they defile not, so they sanctify not the man, seeing 'they go down into the belly, and are cast out into the draught.'"

"Thirdly, if Christ's body be really in the Sacrament, it must needs either long since have an end, or else the Lord must daily create him new bodies, and a thousand bodies at once, seeing that he is so often eaten up, and in so many places at the same time. *If it be said that the same body can be in many places at once, and that it is not wasted and spent though it be often eaten, through God's miraculous working, I answer, that this is contrary to all not only natural but also enlightened reason,* seeing that no quantity can be eaten, and by eating consumed (as the bread and wine in the sacrament are), but it is wasted and spent. . . . . Again, *a body cannot be in many places at once, but being a continued quantity, it must fill the intervallum also, betwixt one place and another,* though through miracle not visibly, yet so as that it may be felt, and hinder the passage of other bodies, *otherwise the body must be turned into a spirit that hath not flesh and bones, and the nature thereof must cease to be;* for though mysteries in divinity be above philosophical reason, yet they are not clean contrary unto it, as this is, if there be such a mystery."[1]

From his remarks on the question and answer, "What is the inward part," &c. &c., I take the following extract :—

"The inward part of the Lord's Supper is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are present to all the faithful. In handling whereof three questions arise. First, how is the Lord's body and blood there? For that he is received by the faithful is plain, both because he saith, 'This is my body,' and, 'My body is meat indeed, and my blood drink indeed;' and from the doctrine of the Apostle, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ. The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' But how is his body there to be communicated? Not by Transubstantiation, as hath been already showed; *nor by Consubstantiation, so as that his body is in, under, or about the bread,* as the Lutherans teach; but ONLY IN A SPIRITUAL AND SACRAMENTAL MANNER, FAITH MAKING HIM PRESENT UNTO THE WORTHY

[1] pp. 57—59.

RECEIVER: even as hereby we possess everlasting life, according to that, 'He that believeth in me hath everlasting life.' For *as faith is an eye unto which things to come are present, so it is a hand holding them, a mouth feeding upon them, and a stomach receiving them, and uniting them unto the person that believeth.* If it be said, then the sacrament is vain, seeing by faith Christ may be received without it, and he is not outwardly any whit the more present with his body, I answer, God forbid: for it is God's ordinance to help our faith, an outward means to convey unto us inward grace and sanctification, his seal to confirm our faith in his gracious promises. As when the king bestoweth anything upon a subject, he is assured hereof by his mere donation and giving it unto him, but yet he appointeth unto him to take the state thereof, a means of writing and sealing, to ratify what he hath granted for more assurance; which writings and seal, though they contain not the estate about them or in them, that is, the house or [*misprinted*, our] ground in quantity, yet they convey them unto him; so, *though the body of Christ be in heaven, and, being given unto us by the Father, is made ours through faith,* yet it hath pleased him for more assurance to appoint the sacrament, hereby to convey this rich possession unto us, and to write and seal to our hearts, that Christ is ours, by his holy body sanctifying our bodies and souls, and by his blood cleansing us from all our sins, *though his body be not in or about the bread really in the quantity,* as it was heretofore upon earth. And of like nature were the ancient sacraments appointed to the Fathers, *unto which though Christ was not really and corporally annexed, yet unto the receivers they were Christ through faith;* for 'the rock was Christ,' 'Christ was the Lamb.'"[1]

At the end of this passage is added, in the fifth edition, the following somewhat curious paragraph; the introduction of which, however, will not afford the least support to the doctrine of the Authors under review:—

"Or else we may say, that although that which is taken is bread, and that which is received bread, yet *being eaten* it is Christ's body by virtue of his ordinance joined to the body of each *true believer,* by which conjunction he is made flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, and by this Body of the Lord his body and soul is nourished unto eternal life, and although his body dieth, yet it shall by virtue of Christ's body be quickened and raised again at the last day. For he saith, 'Take, eat, this is my body,' that is, *When ye have taken and*

[1] pp. 63—65.

eaten it, but not before, and therefore the Popish worshipping of it is plain ἀρτολατρεία bread-worshipping and gross idolatry." [1]

To whom this curious passage is due, cannot now be ascertained; but its insertion in the first edition during Archbishop Laud's Primacy, after four editions had been published without it, seems to indicate the interference of another hand besides Dr. Mayer's. The question, however, is not one of any moment, as the passage is not one which gives any countenance to the doctrine under consideration. I quote this edition as one which, being published during Laud's Primacy, would be preferred by the Authors under review.

Dr. Mayer proceeds to observe, that Christ is also received "by baptism" and "by the preaching of the Word," and adds:—

"By the Word he is received, as by the draught of a conveyance, and articles of agreement, by the sacraments as by seals put hereunto, baptism being properly the seal of a new life, which is the beginning of everlasting life, we being dead and buried unto sin, the Lord's Supper the seal of the comforts and strength that we grow unto in this life, as by most wholesome meats and drinks, till that in the life to come we shall be continually feasted with him, he being meat and drink and clothing and wealth and all in all unto us evermore." [2]

Again, on the question and answer, "What are the benefits," &c., he says:—

"We say that it is the strengthening and refreshing of the soul. More distinctly, whatsoever benefit redoundeth to the corporal life from the bread and wine, the like redoundeth herefrom to the worthy receiver, by virtue of Christ's body and blood, as before hath been particularly declared. This made them in the Primitive Church to seek so earnestly after it, that though Christ in body was now absent from doing these good offices unto them, yet they might be supplied by this *visible sign* of his continual presence to the world's end. Again, yet more distinctly, we have hereby communion with Christ, and through him with the Father, we becoming flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, as the bread and wine being eaten and [? are] incorporated into us. 2. Strength of faith, *it being as it were a hand, a mouth, and stomach, with these signs receiving Christ,* as hath been said." [3]

[1] p. 65. [2] p. 65. [3] p. 69.

Again, on the question and answer, "What is required" &c., he says:—

"Faith is the hand of the soul, reaching out unto Christ; for as the woman touched him, and was healed of her bloody issue, so the faithful touch him, handle and receive him, to the healing of all their spiritual diseases, for faith purifieth the heart from all filthiness of sin. Acts xv. 9. And justifieth, although our deeds being lookt, we are most unjust and sinful. Rom. iii. 28. True faith, as in Abraham, is imputed to every one for righteousness. Rom. iv. 3, &c. Faith is the mouth of the soul feeding upon Christ; for when the Lord had taught, that his body must be eaten, and that he which eateth hath everlasting life, he affirmeth the same of the believer: 'He that believeth in me, hath everlasting life.' *Faith is the digesting faculty of the stomach of the soul, working so effectually, that Christ becometh hereby our nourishment*, and 'we are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones,' as the Apostle teacheth. Lastly, whatsoever may be more desired, a person pleasing unto God, an eye to see God, feet to come unto God, faith giveth all; for, being justified by faith, 'we have peace with God;' by faith the ancient Fathers 'saw the promises afar off,' that is, Christ; and by faith Enoch as with feet walked with God."[1]

In this language we see clearly what the divines of those days meant when they spoke of the body and blood of Christ being "verily and indeed received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." And it is only from a want of acquaintance with the phraseology of those days that any difficulty could arise as to the meaning of the words "verily and indeed received," when so used.

And before I pass on, I would point out to the reader, that Dr. Mayer, while using the language just quoted from him, uses nevertheless without hesitation the language so frequently quoted from the Fathers by the Authors under review as showing that the Fathers maintained their doctrine, and speaks of the elements as the body and blood of Christ. Thus for instance he says:—"Moreover, how can *the minister give the Lord's body* to him that is appointed by the Lord to be given over to Satan."[2] He calls even what is given to the wicked "the Lord's body;" but in what *sense*, his language in the context clearly shows.

[1] pp. 73,74. [2] p. 80.

The next exposition of the Catechism to which I refer is that by *Dr. Richard Sherlock.*[1]

"Q. What is the inward part or thing signified by the sacramental bread and wine?

"A. The body of Christ broken upon the Cross, by the bread; and his blood poured out, by the wine: and as the bread and wine are truly taken and received *corporally*, so verily and indeed is the body and blood of Christ taken and received *spiritually of every true faithful* SOUL in the Lord's Supper if rightly administered.

"Q. What are the benefits whereof we are made partakers by the right receiving of the Lord's Supper?

"A. Our souls are thereby strengthened with Divine grace, and refreshed with the sense of God's mercy, by the virtue of Christ's Body and Blood spiritually received, even as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed in the use of common and material bread and wine."[2]

The next exposition of the Catechism that was published (as far as I am aware) was that by *Bishop Nicolson.*[3] From it I give the following extracts:—

"Christ is said to be present four manner of ways. 1. Divinely, as God, and so he is present in all places..... 2. Spiritually, and so is he present in the sacrament, *because* he hath ordained the sacrament to represent and communicate Christ's death unto us..... 4. Corporally; so present in Judea in the days of his flesh.

"And as the word *presence*, so the word *really*, is diversly taken. For sometimes—1. It is opposed to that which is feigned, and is but imaginary, and imports as much as *truly*. 2. It is opposed to that which is merely figurative, and barely representative, and imports as much as *effectually*. 3. It is opposed to that which is

[1] The Principles of Holy Christian Religion: or, The Catechism of the Church of England Paraphrased, &c. By Richard Sherlock, D.D., Rector of Winwick in Lancashire.—The first edition was published about the year 1660. I quote from the 4th ed. Lond. 1661. 12mo, and ed. 13. Lond. 1677, 12mo.

[2] 4th ed. p. 37. 13th ed. pp. 53, 54.

[3] A Plain, but Full Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England.—The first edition of this was published, Lond. 1655. 4to. with an Epistle dedicatory lamenting the state of the times and the prohibition of the English Liturgy. On the Restoration the Author was immediately made Bishop of Gloucester, and another edition of this Exposition was published by him in 1661, 4to. dedicated to Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, then Bishop of London; and several other editions followed in the course of the following years. It is on the list of the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society. I quote from an edition of 1662. 4to.

spiritual, and imports as much as *corporally* or *bodily*. We then believe Christ to be present in the Eucharist divinely [i. e. as God] after a special manner; spiritually, *in the hearts of the communicants;* sacramentally, *or* RELATIVELY in the elements. And this presence of his is *real*, in the two former acceptions of *real*, but not in the last, for he is *truly* and *effectually* there present, though *not corporally, bodily*, carnally, locally."[1]

"But this is not all, for what is here represented is verily and indeed taken and received. It is on all hands confessed, that in this sacrament there is a true and real participation of Christ, who thereby imparts himself, even his whole entire person as a mystical head, unto every soul that receives him, and that every receiver doth thereby incorporate and unite himself to Christ as a mystical member of him, and of them also whom he acknowledgeth to be his own. This though mystically, yet it is truly; though invisibly, yet it is really done. Of this St. Paul assures us. 'The cup of blessing,' &c. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. It is as if the Apostle had said, Know you not this, that the breaking, taking, eating this bread, the pouring forth, taking and drinking this wine, is the real communication of the body and blood of Christ to you. . . . This, then, the Apostle intends to assert, and assure a worthy communicant, that, as verily as he eats the bread with his mouth, and takes down the wine, so verily *God in heaven bestows on him*, and communicates unto him the body and blood of his Saviour, and the benefits of that body and blood, which in two words are pardon and grace. But because THE SACRAMENT IN ITSELF BEING A CORRUPTIBLE AND EARTHLY SUBSTANCE must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we altogether are to rest upon the strength of his glorious power and goodness, who is able, and will bring to pass, that the bread and wine which he giveth us shall be truly the thing he promiseth. This is *an act of faith*, which is required in every one that really means to partake of the benefit; and therefore the Catechism warily adds, that it must be taken and received 'by the faithful.' Christ's death in the sacrament is offered to all, but it is effectual only to believers. . . . The reason is, because whatsoever Christ hath done already, or hath promised hereafter to do for us, are to us as never done, as never to be done, till we believe them: *that which gives them a being, and* MAKES THEM PRESENT AND EXISTENT TO US, *is our faith.*"[2]

[1] pp. 193, 194. The reader will observe that Bishop Nicolson has no notion of such a self-contradiction as a *spiritual bodily* presence.

[2] pp. 198, 199.

Speaking of the words, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man," &c. (John vi. 53.), he says,—

"They had not a literal, they had a spiritual sense; and he that would make them life unto him, must so understand them; believe that he was that heavenly manna, and by faith eat his flesh and drink his blood."[1]

"For this we believe too, and in confidence thereof approach and take this Body and this Blood, being assured that by these symbols we receive all Christ. *Out of which it is as clear as the sun, that* THIS SACRAMENT IS RECEIVED BY, AND ONLY BY, THE FAITHFUL. UNBELIEVERS MAY RECEIVE *panem Domini*, THE BREAD OF THE LORD; BELIEVERS ONLY *panem Dominum*, THAT BREAD WHICH IS THE LORD."[2]

"FOR TO SAY, RECEIVE MY BODY, IS AS IF HE HAD SAID, RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST, THAT IS, THE GRACES OF THE HOLY GHOST. And this grace to the soul is what bread, that staff of life, is to the body."[3]

"What merit, force, virtue, soever there is in his sacrificed Body and Blood, we freely, fully, and wholly have it imparted by this sacrament."[4]

"Now if it be demanded, How so small a piece of bread, or a spoonful of wine, can produce this effect? the answer is easy, that it proceeds not from the elements, but from the will and power of Christ, who ordained these to be means and instruments for that end. They remain in substance what they were; but *in relation to him* are more. It is spiritual bread, and spiritual wine; so called, not so much because spiritually received, but because, being so received, *it causes us to receive the Spirit*, and by the power of the Spirit a man may be enabled to do all things. Phil. iv. 13."[5]

I quote next from what is commonly called the "*Oxford Catechism*,"[6] which has been for a great number of years on the list of the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society.

"*Outward and visible sign—ordained by Christ himself, &c.*] Christ in his gracious condescension to us ordained sacramental signs, 1. To inform our understandings; 2. To refresh our memories; and 3. To excite our affections.

[1] p. 199. [2] p. 200. [3] p. 201. [4] p. 203. [5] p. 203.

[6] The Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer briefly explained by Short Notes grounded upon Holy Scripture. Printed at the Theatre in Oxford. 1679. 12mo. I quote from the edition printed at the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1797. 12mo., circulated by the Christian Knowledge Society.

"*As a means whereby we receive, &c.*] The outward signs do signify, exhibit and seal *the spiritual graces to the believing receiver.*

"*Two parts.*] The use of the outward signs, both in Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is warranted by God's command; and the benefit of the inward graces, both in that first and second sacrament, is assured by God's promise."[1]

"*Bread and wine, &c.*] Christ was pleased to set forth our most intimate communion with him, by enjoining us to receive such food as is most useful for the maintenance of life, bread being the food of most. Bread is a sort of necessary food, of most common, daily and wholesome use: and wine the liquor which serveth not only to quench thirst, but also to relieve bodily infirmities. So that bread and wine, being most excellent in their kind, do fitly set forth that perfect spiritual nourishment, which is to be found in Christ.

"*The Body and Blood of Christ, &c.*] The bread broken signifieth the Body of Christ broken for us: and the wine poured out, signifieth the Blood of Christ shed for us.

"The bread and wine administered signify and seal the giving of Christ, with all the benefits of his death to the true believer.

"The Body and Blood of Christ are spiritually received by the worthy communicant *through the grace of faith.*[2]

"*The strengthening and refreshing of our souls, &c.*] As the soul or inward man to be here fed is a spirit, so the Body and Blood of Christ is spiritual food, and is to be received *after a spiritual manner.*

"Bread and wine at the Lord's Table are not changed in nature, but in use; as being outward signs ordained, according to the nature of sacraments, to signify something which is inward and spiritual."[3]

I refer next to the brief exposition of the Catechism, by the learned *Dr. Comber, Dean of Durham.*[4]

"Do believers feed on the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, as truly and really as they do on the bread and

[1] p. 44.

[2] In the first edition this sentence stood thus:—"The Body and Blood of Christ are really received *into the heart* of the *worthy* communicant, *by the grace of faith:*" words of the same meaning, but perhaps not so simple as those above.

[3] pp. 47, 48.

[4] The Church Catechism, with a Brief and Easy Explanation thereof, &c. By T. C., D.D. I quote from the ed. publ. Lond. 1683. 8vo.

wine? *Yes.* Is this done after a corporal and carnal manner? *No.* Or is it done *after a spiritual manner,* WHILE BY FAITH THEY APPLY TO THEMSELVES THE BENEFITS OF CHRIST'S DEATH? *Yes.*"[1]

"Must every one that would spiritually feed on Christ in this sacrament understand and believe, 1. Their own misery by sin, original and actual? 2. The sufficiency of Christ's death, &c. &c.? *Yes.*"[2]

The next I shall quote is that by *Dr. Simon Ford.*[3]

Arguing against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he urges the argument,—"Because the Evangelists tell us, that in "the first Institution our Saviour himself, in his natural body, "was the administrator of this sacrament to his disciples: and "therefore he could not be eaten by them, in that gross sense "which this doctrine puts on his words:"[4]—an argument which has precisely the same application against the doctrine of the Authors under review.

"Q. What mean you, then, when you say, that the Body and Blood of Christ are 'verily and indeed' taken and received there? A. That we receive them not only in imagination, but truly, though not grossly, and carnally, but *spiritually and by faith;* as our Saviour himself interprets the meaning of 'eating his flesh and drinking his blood,' to undeceive those who stumbled and were offended at that expression of his.

"Q. You say, that the Body and Blood of Christ are thus received by 'the faithful.' Do none then but believers thus receive them? A. *No: for they are to be received by faith, which unbelievers have not. And they give eternal life to those that receive them, of which unbelievers, remaining such, are uncapable.*"[5]

I proceed to the Exposition of *Bishop Ken,*[6] whose language is quoted by the partisans of the Authors under review in support of their doctrine. And the mystical language in which

[1] p. 31. [2] p. 32.

[3] A Plain and Profitable Exposition of, and Enlargement upon, the Church Catechism, &c. By Simon Ford, D.D., and Rector of Old Swinford, in Worcestershire. Lond. 1684. 8vo.

[4] p. 91. [5] pp. 91, 92.

[6] An Exposition on the Church Catechism; or, the Practice of Divine Love. Composed for the Diocese of Bath and Wells. Lond. 1685, 8vo. An Exposition on the Church Catechism; or, the Practice of Divine Love *revised.* Composed for the Diocese of Bath and Wells. Lond. 1686, 8vo. This was succeeded by many other editions, which followed the revised edition.

the Bishop was in the habit of indulging might perhaps lead a superficial reader, unaccustomed to discriminate between theological statements differing in character, while in some respects adopting the same words, to suppose that his views were favorable to that doctrine. But it will be seen by the careful reader, that while he uses strong expressions respecting the reality of our participation of the Body and Blood of Christ, he always limits that participation to *the soul*, and to the *faithful receiver*, which is fatal to the doctrine of the Authors under review.

The first edition of his Exposition was printed in the year 1685. And this was followed by a "revised" edition in 1686, which was taken as the standard in the subsequent editions. And to this revised edition is prefixed the following notice:—

"The Author thinks himself obliged to declare, that he does now, and always did, humbly submit this *Exposition* to the judgment of the *Church of England*, conformable to whose *Articles* he desires all good Christians to interpret it; and to prevent all misunderstandings for the future, he has in his revising it made some few little alterations, not at all varying his meaning, but his expressions, to render the whole as unexceptionable as becomes a book not designed for dispute but for devotion."

The reason for this Advertisement, and its meaning, are obvious.

And the revision in this edition includes a remarkable alteration of some expressions quoted by a partisan of the Authors under review,[1] which are cited by him without the least notice of their having been thus altered, or of the Advertisement prefixed to the second edition, which clearly shows in what way the Bishop wished his words to be interpreted.

I shall first notice the extracts given in the work just referred to.

"I believe, O crucified Lord, that the bread which we break in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries is the communication of thy Body, and the cup of blessing which we bless is the communication of thy Blood, and that thou dost as effectually and really convey thy Body and Blood TO OUR SOULS by the Bread and Wine, as

[1] The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as set forth in the Works of Divines and others of the English Church since the Reformation. 1855. Pt. 1. p. 128.

thou didst thy Holy Spirit by thy breath to thy disciples, for which all love, all glory, be to thee." [1]

Now in this extract the words which I have put in capitals at once show that the doctrine of the Authors under review was not that which the Bishop intended to inculcate by this sentence. For this speaks only of a communication "*to our souls,*" about which there is no dispute, the point in dispute being whether the Body and Blood are communicated to our mouths.

"Lord, what need I labour in vain to search out the manner of thy mysterious presence in the sacrament, when my love assures me thou art there? All the faithful who approach thee, with prepared hearts, they well know thou art there; they feel the virtue of divine love going out of thee to heal their infirmities and to inflame their affections; for which all love, all glory, be to thee." [2]

I need only observe on this extract, that the presence here spoken of is what all admit.

But the passage evidently more especially relied upon is one *which is given in this work exactly in the following way:—*

"O God incarnate, how thou canst give us thy flesh to eat and thy blood to drink; how thy flesh is meat indeed; how thou who art in heaven, art present on the altar, I can by no means explain; but I firmly believe it all, because thou hast said it, and I firmly rely on thy love and on thy omnipotence to make good thy word, though the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend." [3]

Now, first, I must beg the reader to compare this passage, as thus quoted in this Tractarian Catena, with the passage as it stands in the work from which the citation is professedly made, which runs thus:—

"O God incarnate, how thou canst give us thy flesh to eat and thy blood to drink; how thy flesh is meat indeed, and thy blood is drink indeed; HOW HE THAT EATETH THY FLESH AND DRINKETH THY BLOOD DWELLETH IN THEE AND THOU IN HIM; HOW HE SHALL LIVE BY THEE AND SHALL BE RAISED UP BY THEE TO LIFE ETERNAL; how thou who art in heaven, art present on the altar, I can by no means explain," &c.[4]

[1] p. 76, ed. 1685; pp. 143, 144, ed. 1686.
[2] p. 76, ed. 1685; p. 144, ed. 1686.
[3] The Doctrine of the Real Presence, &c. (as cited above), p. 128.
[4] p. 76, ed. 1685.

The reader will observe, that, without the slightest intimation, or break in the professed quotation, words have been omitted in the middle of the sentence, which completely disprove the pertinency of the passage as evidence for the doctrine for which it is cited. For by those words, spiritual life and resurrection to life eternal are spoken of as the consequence of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ. And by those words the meaning of the Author in the whole passage must be judged of.

Further, in the revised edition, published by the Author in the following year, this sentence is altered to the following:—

"O God incarnate, how the bread and the wine, unchanged in their substance, become thy Body and thy Blood; after what extraordinary manner thou, who art in heaven, ART PRESENT THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE SACRAMENTAL ACTION TO EVERY DEVOUT RECEIVER; [instead of the words, *art present on the altar*] how thou canst give us thy flesh to eat and thy blood to drink; how thy flesh is meat indeed, and thy blood is drink indeed; how he that eateth thy flesh, and drinketh thy blood, dwelleth in thee and thou in him; how he shall live by thee, and be raised up by thee to life eternal: I can by no means comprehend; but I firmly believe all thou hast said, and I firmly rely on thy omnipotent love to make good thy word; for which all love, all glory, be to thee." [1]

This revision, at any rate, settles the question of the Author's meaning.

But I will add one more sentence from this Exposition,—one that occurs in the *first* as well as the subsequent editions.

"Glory be to thee, O mighty Love, who hast elevated these obvious and outward signs to an efficacy far above their natures, not only to signify, but to be happy means and instruments, to convey thy grace to us, to be seals and pledges to confirm and assure to us the communications of thy love, that our sight may assist our faith, that IF WITH DUE PREPARATION WE RECEIVE THEM, BOTH PARTS OF THE SACRAMENT WILL GO TOGETHER; as certainly as we receive the outward and visible sign, so certainly shall we receive the inward and invisible grace, for which all love, all glory, be to thee." [2]

[1] ed. 1686, p. 143; and the subsequent editions.
[2] ed. 1685, p. 70. ed. 1686, p. 133.

The doctrine here laid down is clearly, that "both parts of the sacrament will go together" only in the case where the elements are received "with due preparation"—a doctrine which plucks up by the roots the system of the Authors under review. It is the *precise negation* of the fundamental principle so frequently insisted upon by the two Archdeacons.

So much for the support our Authors derive from Bishop Ken. I hope to find room in the next Chapter for some further remarks on his views.

I refer next to the Exposition of *Dr. John Williams,* Bishop of Chichester,[1] in which are the following passages:—

"Q. For what end did our Lord ordain it [i. e. 'the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.'] ? A. 1. As a sign and representation of the sacrifice of his death (1 Cor. xi. 24), and a means to keep up the remembrance of it. 2. As a means to convey and a pledge to assure us of the benefits we receive thereby. (Matt. xxvi. 28.)"[2]

"Q. Are the bread and wine changed after consecration? A. *Not otherwise than in their* USE; for they remain the same in nature and substance as before. So it is thrice called bread. (1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, 28.)

"Q. What is the Body and Blood of Christ which here are said to be verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful? A. 1. Negatively. It is *not the natural* Body and Blood of Christ. (1.) Because the Catechism saith, the inward part or thing signified by the bread and wine in the sacrament is the Body and Blood of Christ; and so the bread and wine are the signs of that Body and Blood, and not that very natural Body and Blood. (2.) Because it is said, 'The Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received therein by the faithful;' *in opposition to unbelievers, who (as our Article 29th saith)* '*eat not the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper.*' 2. I answer positively, That by the Body and Blood of Christ is meant Christ himself, who suffered in his body, and shed his blood for us. John vi. 53-56. 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' &c., his 'flesh and blood,' that is, himself, as it immediately follows, v. 57, 'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me.' Thus 'flesh and blood' are taken for man. Matt. xvi. 17. 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee.'

[1] A Brief Exposition of the Church Catechism, with Proofs from Scripture.—The first edition was published about the year 1690. I quote from the 18th ed. Lond. 1709, 12mo.

[2] p. 59.

"Q. How is the Body and Blood of Christ 'verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper'? A. *The faithful do receive Christ* (who thus suffered in his body and shed his blood) *by faith*. As the 'flesh and blood' of Christ are Christ himself, so 'eating' and 'receiving' are the same with 'believing.' John vi. 35. 'I am the bread of life,' &c. v. 51. 'If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.' v. 54. 'Whoso eateth my flesh,' &c. v. 56, 57.

"Q. Are the benefits we receive by Christ another thing than his flesh and blood? A. Yes; they differ as much as Christ himself doth from the benefits he hath purchased for us." [1]

I proceed to the well-known exposition of *Archbishop Wake*,[2] one of the most learned prelates of our Church; and I suppose it will be admitted, that the following passages subvert the very foundations upon which the doctrine of the Authors under review rests:—

"Q. Are the Body and Blood of Christ really distributed to every communicant in this sacrament? A. *No, they are not; for then every communicant, whether prepared or not for it, would alike receive Christ's Body and Blood there.* That which is given by the priest to the communicant is, as to its nature, the same after consecration that it was before, namely, bread and wine: *only altered as to its use and signification.*

"Q. If the Body and Blood of Christ be not really given and distributed by the priest, how can they be verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful communicant? A. That which is given by the priest is, as to its substance, bread and wine; as to its sacramental nature and signification, it is the figure or representation of Christ's Body and Blood, which was broken and shed for us. The very Body and Blood of Christ as yet it is not. But *being with faith and piety received by the communicant*, it becomes to him, by the blessing of God and the grace of the Holy Spirit, the very Body and Blood of Christ. As to those who come unworthily to it, it is made damnation, that is, it renders them worthy of it, and, without repentance, will certainly consign them over unto it.

"Q. How does the bread and wine become to the faithful and worthy communicant the very Body and Blood of Christ? A. As

[1] pp. 60, 61.

[2] The Principles of the Christian Religion, explained in a Brief Commentary upon the Church Catechism.—This was first published about the year 1697. I quote from "the fifth edition corrected, Lond. 1731," 8vo., published when Dr. Wake was Archbishop of Canterbury.

it entitles him to a part in the sacrifice of his death, and to the benefits thereby procured to all his faithful and obedient servants.

"Q. How does every such communicant take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in this sacrament? A. By faith: and by means whereof he who comes worthily to the Holy Table, is as truly entitled to a part in Christ's sacrifice, by receiving the sacramental bread and wine, which is there delivered to him, as any man is entitled to an estate, by receiving a deed of conveyance from one who has a power to deliver it to his use." [1]

"Q. Is this the only way in which you suppose Christ's Body and Blood to be really present in this sacrament? A. It is the only way in which I conceive it possible for them to be present there. As for his Divine nature, that being infinite, he is by virtue thereof everywhere present. But in his human nature, and particularly his body, he is in heaven only; *nor can that be any otherwise present to us on earth, than by figure and representation; or else by such a communion as I have before been speaking of.*

"Q. Does not Christ expressly say, that the bread is his Body and the cup his Blood? A. He does say of the bread and wine so *taken, blessed, broken, and given* as they were by him in that sacred action, that 'This is my body,' &c., and so they are. The bread which we break is not only in figure and similitude, but by a real spiritual communion his Body: the cup of blessing which we bless, is, by the same communion, his Blood. But this does not hinder but that, as to their own natural substances, they may, and indeed do, still continue to be what they appear to us, the same bread and wine that before they were." [2]

"Q. Can the same thing be Christ's Body and bread too? A. I have before shown you not only that it may be so, but that it truly and really is so: bread in substance, the Body of Christ *by signification, by representation, and spiritual communication, of his crucified Body,* to every *faithful and worthy receiver.*" [3]

In the following passage he gives his reasons against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the reader will observe that all his leading objections to it apply with equal force to the doctrine of the Authors under review:—

"Q. How is Transubstantiation contrary to our reason? A. As my reason tells me *it is a contradiction to say of one and the same natural body, that it should be in heaven and on earth, at London and at Rome, at the same time: that it should be a true human body, and yet not have any one part or member of such a body:* to omit a

[1] pp. 163, 164. [2] pp. 165, 166. [3] p. 167.

hundred other absurdities, that are the necessary consequences of such a belief.

"Q. How does the Scripture contradict this belief? A. As it tells, *that Christ's Body is in heaven; absent from us; that it there is to continue till the day of judgment:* that he has now a glorified body, and is not capable of dying any more: whereas the Body we receive, in this holy sacrament, is his *crucified Body;* his body given for us; his Blood shed for us; which can never be verified in his present glorified Body.

"Q. Do not those who believe Transubstantiation believe the bread and wine to be changed into Christ's mortal and passible Body? A. No, they do not; but into that Body in which he now sits at the right hand of God in heaven.

"Q. How then does their belief of Transubstantiation contradict the sense of the Holy Scriptures as to what concerns the nature of Christ's Body in the Eucharist? A. Because by supposing Christ's glorified Body to be that which we receive in this sacrament, they utterly destroy the very nature of it. It was the design of this sacrament to exhibit and communicate to us the Body and Blood of Christ, not any way, but *in the state of his suffering, as he was given for us and became a sacrifice for our sins.* Now this he neither was, nor could have been, in this present glorified estate. So that if the Body and Blood of Christ be in this sacrament, it must be not that which he now has in heaven, but that which he then had when he suffered for us upon earth; and they must not only bring Christ down from above, but must bring him back again to his mortal and passible estate; or they will never be able to make good any such change as they pretend to: and that, I think, is sufficiently contrary to Scripture, as well as in the nature of the thing itself impossible." [1]

There can be no doubt, therefore, as to Archbishop Wake's views respecting such a doctrine as that of the Authors under review.

The next I shall quote is that by the well-known divine of our Church, the *Rev. John Lewis* of Margate,[2] author of several works of good repute among us.

[1] pp. 167, 168.

[2] The Church Catechism explained by way of Question and Answer, and confirmed by Scripture Proofs, &c. Collected by John Lewis, Minister of Margate, in Kent.—It was first published about 1700, 12mo. I quote from the 36th edition, 1794, 12mo.

In his Life by Chalmers, it is said, "On his becoming a member of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, he was desired to draw up a Short and Plain Exposition of the Church Catechism, fit for the children educated in charity-schools; and this, which he executed to the entire satisfaction of the Society, has passed through many editions."[1] It has ever since remained on the list of the Society's publications.

"Q. For what end did our Lord appoint it [i. e. "the Lord's Supper"]?

"A. As a means to keep up the remembrance of the sacrifice of his death, and to convey and assure to us the benefits we receive thereby."[2]

"Q. How is the Body and Blood of Christ verily and indeed taken and received?

"A. All who rightly receive this sacrament do thereby actually partake of that great sacrifice which Christ offered; and of all the benefits which he thereby merited for mankind, in order to the sanctifying and saving of their souls."[3]

"Q. How are our souls strengthened and refreshed by the Body and Blood of Christ?

"A. By being meet partakers of the sacramental bread and wine, we are assured of Christ's favour and goodness towards us; that we are true and living members of his Body the Church, and also heirs, through hope, of his everlasting kingdom."[4]

In some of the earlier editions, the answers are somewhat different in words, though the same in sense, as far as concerns our present subject. Thus, in the second edition, published in 1702, the answer to the question, "How is the body," &c. stands thus:—"By receiving the sacramental bread and wine, the faithful are united to Christ Jesus as their Head, and made partakers of his merits."

I refer next to the Exposition of *Bishop Beveridge*,[5] whose name is too well known to need any recommendation.

On that part of the Catechism relating to the sacrament of

[1] CHALMERS'S Biographical Dict. *sub nom.*

[2] p. 86. [3] p. 88. [4] pp. 88, 89.

[5] The Church Catechism explained for the use of the Diocese of St. Asaph.—The first edition was published, Lond. 1704, 4to. I quote from the 4th ed. Lond. 1709. 12mo.

the Lord's Supper, the Bishop makes these, among other, remarks:—

"The outward part or sign in this sacrament is only 'bread and wine, which the Lord commanded to be received,' that is, to be received into our bodies. For, in the institution of this sacrament, when he had blessed the bread, he said, 'Take, eat:' &c. . . . . But the inward part or thing signified by that sign in the Lord's Supper, is 'the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.' For, when the Lord at his Last Supper had taken bread, and blessed it, and given it to his disciples, saying, 'Take, eat,' he presently said, 'This is my Body, which was broken for you.' . . . . . Whereby he plainly signified, That what he now gave them to eat and drink, he would have them look upon it, and receive it, not as common bread and wine, but as his Body and Blood; the one as broken, the other as shed, for their sins. Which therefore are not in show and appearance, but 'verily and indeed' (ACCORDING TO THE SENSE WHEREIN THE LORD INSTITUTING THE SACRAMENT SPOKE THOSE WORDS) 'taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper:' 'by the faithful,' even by all such, AND ONLY SUCH as believe the Gospel and what our Lord said, and accordingly receive what he now gives them with a true faith: which being 'the substance of things hoped for,' as well as 'the evidence of things not seen,' Heb. xi. 1., it causeth that which our Lord said, and what they therefore hope for and receive upon his word, to subsist really and effectually in them, to all intents and purposes, to which the Body and Blood of Christ can possibly be communicated and received; according to that remarkable saying of his Apostle to the same purpose, 'The cup of blessing,' &c. 1 Cor. x. 16." [1]

"He that doth it unworthily, in an unworthy, irreverent and unseemly manner, not becoming so holy an institution, as the Corinthians he speaks of did it, such a one eateth and drinketh, NOT THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, but 'damnation' (or rather, as that word signifies, 'judgment') to himself; at least some temporal judgment, as he explains it in the next verse, saying, 'For this cause,' &c. v. 30." [2] "WITHOUT FAITH, AS HATH BEEN SHOWN, THEY CANNOT RECEIVE THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST AT ALL, AND THEREFORE NOT WORTHILY." [3]

Other passages might be added, but these are sufficient.

Here also, however, we must observe, that, following the ordinary custom of the Fathers and other theologians in calling

[1] pp. 133, 134. [2] p. 139. [3] p. 142.

the signs by the names of the things signified, he calls the consecrated elements, without hesitation, (even as received by the unfaithful, who he tells us do "not receive the Body and Blood of Christ *at all,*") by the name of the Body and Blood of Christ. For, speaking of the unworthy receivers among the Corinthians, he says, that they "ventured to come to it [i. e. the Lord's Supper] as to an ordinary meal; and to *eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ* like common meat and drink."[1]

Notwithstanding, however, these statements of Bishop Beveridge, both here and in the passages I have quoted above upon the Articles,[2] he is claimed in the Tractarian Catena of English divines on this subject, already referred to,[3] as a supporter of the doctrine opposed in this work; and quotations given from him, which, however they may be calculated to mislead those unversed in the language of theologians on this subject, do not, in fact, *touch* the point in question; any more than the last passage I have quoted from him above, which may be taken as a specimen of by far the greater number of the passages quoted from divines by the Authors under review and their partisans, as maintaining their doctrine.

I would next refer to the Exposition of another esteemed divine of our Church, *Dr. Edward Wells*.[4] A brief extract will suffice:

"Q. What is the inward part or thing signified in this sacrament?

"A. The Body and Blood of Christ, which (*as far forth as they are the spiritual food of our souls, or efficacious to our eternal salvation*) are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful (or such as worthily partake thereof) in the Lord's Supper.

"Q. What are the benefits whereof we (by worthily receiving the sacrament) are made partakers thereby?

"A. The strengthening and refreshing of our souls, &c. For as often as we receive worthily, God does thereby give us new and fresh

[1] p. 138.

[2] See pp. 678—680 above. The Doctrine of the Real Presence, &c. Pt. 2. pp. 36, 37.

[4] The Common Christian rightly and plainly instructed in the grounds of Christianity; or, an Exposition of the Church Catechism. Oxford, 1707. 12mo. The name of the Author is not on the title, but is attached to the preliminary address to the Parishioners of Cotesbach.

assurances of his favour and goodness towards us, and that we are true members of his Church," &c.[1]

I proceed to the Exposition of *Bishop Burnet*,[2] from which I might quote largely, but I content myself with the following decisive passages :—

"Q. What is the meaning of the words, 'This is my Body,' and 'This cup is the New Testament in my Blood?' A. The Lamb was through both Old and New Testament called the Lord's Passover: whereas the Passover was the angels passing by the houses of the Israelites, that were sprinkled with the blood of the Lamb, when he smote the first-born of the Ægyptians: so the Lamb being the memorial of it, carried the name of it. Thus this rite being instituted to be done in remembrance of the death of Christ, the elements are called *his Body and his Blood*, by which we show forth his death till he come again, as the Lamb was called the Passover."[3]

"Q. Must we not believe Christ's last words to be literally true, and not to be taken only in a figure? A. Figures when much used are easily understood. So this, of calling the memorial by the name of the thing remembered, was easily apprehended by the Disciples, who being Jews knew that the Lamb was called the Lord's Passover. It is also added, 'This is my body given (broken) for you;' and the Body and Blood being represented as separated, shows that Christ is not present in his glorified state, but in his dead state: in which, that being past many ages ago, it is impossible he can be otherwise present, than in a memorial and sacramental representation."[4]

"Q. What is the meaning of that long discourse of our Saviour's, recorded by St. John, in which, in a variety of expressions, the eating his flesh and drinking his blood is often repeated? A. That was spoken before the institution of the sacrament, and so can have no relation to it," &c. &c.[5]

"Q. But how, then, is his Body and Blood verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful? A. Since by his Body and Blood, as separate, the death of Christ is represented, those who

[1] pp. 66, 67.

[2] An Exposition of the Church Catechism for the use of the Diocese of Sarum. By the Right Rev. Father in God, Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum. Lond. 1710. 8vo.

[3] p. 335. [4] p. 337. [5] pp. 337, 338.

receive the sacrament worthily do verily and indeed partake in the death of Christ, as the sacrifice offered up for them.

"Q. How are our souls strengthened by Christ and the merits of his death? A. There is conveyed unto us an inward virtue, that as bodily nourishment revives and enables our bodies to perform everything that is incumbent on us, so worthy communicants, by the share in the death and intercession of Christ, obtain the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, and all the other benefits promised to us in the Gospel.

"Q. For what end was the sacrament instituted? A. To show forth the Lord's death till he come, to be the communion of his Body and Blood, and to unite us into one body, as we partake of one bread." [1]

"Q. What is meant by the communion of Christ's Body and Blood? A. Our joint share and right to the merits and to all the effects of the death and sufferings of Christ, which we can hope for only upon the terms on which they are offered us in the Gospel, to which we put in our humble claim by our coming to partake of this holy ordinance." [2]

The next Exposition that presents itself for our notice is that by the *Rev. John Ollyffe*,[3] and from this one extract will suffice:

"Q. But how is it said, that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken by the faithful in the Lord's Supper? Is not Christ then corporally present there with his Body and Blood? A. No, the Body and Blood of Christ are here said to be the thing signified by the bread and wine. So that it is nothing but bread and wine that is there in substance, but the bread and wine are the signs of the Body and Blood of Christ, which are not there naturally, but are signified and represented by the bread and wine, to the faithful; *by whom therefore alone the Body and Blood of Christ are here said to be verily and indeed taken and received;* that is, by means of their faith, by which Christ and his benefits are to all spiritual intents and purposes as truly and really present to them, or to their minds, as if he did offer and present himself corporally to them, under the forms of bread and wine, if that could be done. *So that it is the bread and wine only that are received into the hands and mouths of the faithful, and by which their bodies are refresht; but Christ himself, and his Body and*

[1] pp. 338, 339. [2] p. 339.

[3] A Practical Exposition of the Church Catechism. By John Ollyffe, Rector of Dunton, in Bucks. Lond. 1710. 2 vols. 8vo.

Blood and benefits, are only present to their minds by faith, and so are verily and indeed taken by the faithful. And to their faith alone it is, that the bread and wine are the very Body and Blood of Christ, by figure, signification, representation and obsignation of the benefits thereof to them." [1]

And he then proceeds to show, that it is "not by Transubstantiation," and that the words, "This is my Body," "are to be understood in a *figurative* and not in a proper sense; this being very agreeable to the custom and manner of speaking, which was very familiar among the Jews, and other Eastern nations, to say, things *are* that which they only *signify* and *represent*."

"It is not to be doubted, indeed, but that our Saviour's words are true, that he speaks, when he saith, 'This is my Body.' But the question only is, in what sense they are to be understood? And this figurative sense being very common and familiar, and easy to be understood in things of this nature, it is very fit and reasonable, that we should understand them in this sense. And this will appear yet more so, if we consider, that it is so far from being necessary or reasonable to understand them in a proper or literal sense, that it is most unreasonable, absurd, and ridiculous; and instead of its being founded on Scripture, that it is downright contrary to the doctrine of it, and of which there is no possible account to be given." [2]

And proceeding to argue further against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he urges against it the following among other objections, which apply equally to the doctrine of the Authors under review:—

"Besides, that which Christ gave to his disciples when he said, 'This is my Body,' was broken before he gave it. For it is said, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and then gave it to them, and pronounced those words; and when he gave them the cup, he said, that this was his Blood shed, and so apart from his Body. But his natural Body was not then broken, nor was his Blood shed, or apart from his body; but this was done afterward, when he suffered upon the cross. Therefore this could not be his natural Body and Blood which he gave them, because it was not yet in that state. But it must be the bread and wine only which he gave them as the symbols of his Body when it should be broken, and of his Blood which was afterwards to be shed.

[1] Vol. ii. p. 787.

[2] pp. 788, 789.

"Besides, if he gave his body to all there present, and to every one his whole Body, then he must have many bodies there at once, besides that body in which he sat or stood by them. So that those bodies which he gave them must be either other or different bodies from his own natural body, or else his body must be one and many together; that is, it must be one and not one, which is a contradiction. And so it must be still, where there are hundreds or thousands of communicants all the world over in all the churches. He must have hundreds or thousands of bodies all-together, and yet these hundreds and thousands of bodies must be his only one body. And yet now the Scripture tells us, his Body is in heaven, and there is to continue 'until the time of the restitution of all things.' Act. iii. 21; Jo. xvi. 28; Matt. xxvi. 11. And there he is in his glorified state, Col. iii. 1. And yet according to this doctrine, his Body must be in a thousand distant places together upon earth too, and that in a broken state. So that it must be the same, and not the same; and it must be one, and not one; and it must be glorified, and not glorified; broken, and not broken at the same time. All which are notorious absurdities and a downright contradiction to Scripture and reason, whereas in our way of interpretation all is easy, familiar, and plain." [1]

I proceed next to the Exposition of the *Rev. Peter Newcome*, Vicar of Hackney, which is dedicated to the Bishop of London.[2]

Speaking of the declaration that the Body and Blood are "verily and indeed taken and received," &c., he says,—

"Not as if Christ's Body and Blood were carnally present in these elements; but *only signified and represented to us by them, whereof they are the sign to us;* and whereby are communicated all those saving graces purchased by them to the worthy receiver. And therefore Christ *calls the signs by the name of the things signified;* not changing the nature, but adding hereby only grace unto the nature of them; so that *a real Presence is not to be sought in the elements, but in the worthy communicants.* For, Christ says first, 'Take and eat' (what he had broken and given), and then after that saith, 'This is my Body.' Intimating that before we 'take and eat,' it is not the Body of Christ unto us; but

[1] pp. 790, 791.

[2] A Catechetical Course of Sermons for the Whole Year, being an Explanation of the Church Catechism. By Peter Newcome, M.A., Vicar of Hackney, in Middlesex. Lond. 1712. 2 vols. 8vo. I quote from the 3rd edition, published in 1712.

that when we 'take and eat' as we ought, then he gives us his whole self, and puts us into possession of all such saving graces as his sacrificed Body can yield, and our souls do then need; whereof the sacramental bread and wine is the outward sign. And therefore as there is no necessity of interpreting those words literally, so *is there a great deal of reason of understanding them only in such a figurative sense* IN OPPOSITION, BOTH TO THE LUTHERAN GROSS NOTION OF CONSUBSTANTIATION, AND THE ROMISH MONSTROUS DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION. *That* offering no less violence to reason than *this* to sense, and *both* to the genuine meaning of the text. For, by the *first*, we are required to believe, that the very Body and Blood of Christ are *so united to the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, as to make up one compound; received at once by one sacramental action;* which improperly supposes that Christ's words of institution must necessarily be understood literally, and falsely thence infers, that this only can be the meaning of them. Whereas, *their figurative sense only is consistent with the nature of a body, that cannot be in many places at once, nor in the same place with any other body* (*which are absurdities this notion includeth*), *and in literal meaning being made use of, do authorize no more consubstantiation than transubstantiation.*" [1]

And he then proceeds to add some remarks against the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

I quote next from the Exposition of the *Rev. Joseph Harrison,* of Cirencester,[2] which I refer to on account of a prefatory letter of commendation from the celebrated Robert Nelson, a favorite referee of the Tractarian party among us.

On the statement, that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received," &c., are these remarks:—

"Q. These words seem to have something of difficulty in them: I pray how do you understand them? A. According to the Church's own interpretation: the meaning thereof is, that God did not only give his Son Jesus Christ to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in this holy sacrament: and that if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament, then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood.

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 528—530.

[2] A Scriptural Exposition of the Church Catechism, &c. For the use of the Parish of Cirencester. By Joseph Harrison, M.A., Minister of that Parish. 2nd ed. corrected. Oxf. 1718. 12mo.

"Q. I remember these expressions in the Communion Service: but what do you infer therefrom? A. That the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith. Article XXVIII.

"Q. *I conclude, then, that the Church of England* KNOWS NO BODILY PRESENCE IN THE SACRAMENT, nor any change of the bread and wine into the natural Body and Blood of Christ; and all that we are required or have reason to believe concerning this matter, is, that the bread and wine after consecration are, by the Divine power and efficacy, made the Body and Blood of Christ *to all spiritual intents and purposes;* and that he, who, with the outward acts of taking and receiving, *feeds on him in his heart by faith*, does verily and indeed partake of all those graces and blessings which Christ merited for mankind by his death, and which this sacrament was designed to convey to the true believer. That then which I am next to ask you is, What are the benefits," &c.[1]

The next Author to whose remarks on the Church Catechism I would refer the reader is one of well-known character and learning, *Archdeacon Waterland*, whose works were reprinted some years since by Bishop Van Mildert. He did not himself publish an Exposition of the Church Catechism, but was the Author of "Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Exposition" of it,[2] in which he has pointed out Dr. Clarke's erroneous statements.

On Dr. Clarke's interpretation of the declaration, that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received," &c., he says,—

"The Exposition rightly interprets 'verily and indeed taken,' &c. of a real 'participation of the benefits purchased by Christ's death,' p. 311. The Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not substantially, not corporally, but verily and indeed, that is, effectually. The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent; but the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed, that is, of his passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. THIS IS ALL THE REAL PRESENCE THAT OUR CHURCH TEACHES."[3]

The reader will observe in this passage the voluntary citation

[1] pp. 118, 119.

[2] First published, Lond. 1730, 8vo.

[3] Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Exposition of the Church Catechism; Works, 2nd ed. by Bishop Van Mildert, Oxford. 1843. vol. vi. p. 42.

from the Homily of the passage quoted from it by Archdeacon Denison as in his favor, and its application in a totally different sense.

I proceed to the Exposition of the excellent *Archbishop Secker*,[1] which also is among the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society.

"To believe that our Saviour took his own body, literally speaking, in his own hands, and gave the whole of that one body to every one of his Apostles, and that each of them swallowed him down their throats, though all the while he continued sitting at the table before their eyes; to believe, that the very same one individual body, which is now in Heaven, is also in many thousands of different places on earth .... is to believe the most absolute impossibilities and contradictions.... They must not say, this doctrine is a mystery. For there is no mystery, no obscurity in it; but it is as plainly seen to be an error, as anything else is seen to be a truth. And the more so, because it relates, not to an infinite nature, as God; but entirely to what is finite, a bit of bread and a human body. They must not plead that God can do all things. For that means only that he can do all things that can be done: not that he can do what cannot be done; make a thing be this, and not be this, be here and elsewhere, at the same time; which is doing and undoing at once, and so in reality doing nothing.... We own that our Saviour said, 'This is my Body, which is broken;' and, 'This is my Blood, which is shed.' But *He could not mean literally*. For as yet his Body was not broken, nor his Blood shed; nor is either of them in that condition now.... The Apostle says, 'the rock,' that supplied the Israelites with water in the wilderness, 'was Christ:' that is, represented Him. Every body says, such a picture is such a person, meaning the representation of him. Why then may not our Saviour's words mean so too?"[2]

"But we acknowledge that the bread and wine are more than a representation of his Body and Blood: they are the means, by which the benefits arising from them are conveyed to us; and have thence a further title to be called by their name. For so the instrument, by which a prince forgives an offender, is called his pardon, because it conveys his pardon; the delivery of a writing is called giving possession of an estate; and a security for a sum of

[1] Lectures on the Catechism of the Church of England.—I quote from the 2nd ed. Lond. 1771, 12mo.

[2] pp. 302, 303.

money is called the sum itself; and is so in virtue and effect, though it is not in strictness of speech, and reality of substance."[1]

And speaking of the declaration, that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received," &c., he says of it,—

"*Words intended to shew that our Church truly believes the strongest assertions of Scripture concerning this Sacrament as the Church of Rome doth; only takes more care to understand them in the right meaning: which is, that though, in one sense, all communicants equally partake of what Christ calls his Body and Blood, that is,* THE OUTWARD SIGNS OF THEM; *yet in a much more important sense, the faithful only, the pious and virtuous receiver, eats his flesh and drinks his blood;* shares in the life and strength derived to men from his incarnation and death; and through faith in him, becomes, by a vital union, one with him; 'a member,' as St. Paul expresses it, 'of his flesh and of his bones:' certainly not in a literal sense, which yet the Romanists might as well assert, as that we eat his flesh in a literal sense; but in a figurative and spiritual one. In appearance, the sacrament of Christ's death is given to all alike: but verily and indeed, in its beneficial effects, to none besides the faithful. Even to the unworthy communicant He is present, *as He is wherever we meet together in his name:* but in a better and most gracious sense to the worthy soul; becoming, *by the inward virtue of his Spirit,* its food and sustenance.

"This real presence of Christ in the sacrament, his Church hath always believed. But *the monstrous notion of his bodily presence* was started 700 years after his death: and arose chiefly from the indiscretion of preachers and writers of warm imaginations, who, instead of explaining judiciously the lofty figures of Scripture language, heightened them, and went beyond them: till both it and they had their meaning mistaken most astonishingly. . . . .

"It is true, we also kneel at the sacrament, as they do: but for a very different purpose: not to acknowledge 'any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood,' as our Church, to prevent all possibility of misconstruction, expressly declares; adding, that 'His Body is in heaven and not here:' but to worship Him who is everywhere present, the invisible God."[2]

The next Exposition I shall notice, is one by the *Rev. James*

[1] p. 304. [2] pp. 305, 306.

Salter, Vicar of St. Mary-Church, Devonshire,[1] which I notice more particularly, because it is dedicated with great respect to Dr. George Lavington, Bishop of Exeter, the opponent of Whitfield and Wesley, and author of a work entitled, "The Enthusiasm of the Methodists and Papists compared," and therefore certainly not chargeable with "Low-churchism;" and in the dedication, the author assures the Bishop, "This Exposition I humbly submit to my holy mother the Church of England."

Nevertheless the voice that then came from St. Mary-Church is very different from what has recently proceeded from the same place, for we find it thus speaking:—

"*Scho.*—Do not we find the bread and wine called in the New Testament the Body and Blood of Christ? *Cat.* I grant it to be so; but then they are sacramentally and figuratively to be understood: This is my Body, or my Blood, i. e. *This is a sign, figure, or representation of them.* And thus may we understand those many passages in Scripture where Christ is called a Vine, a Way, or a Door. Can we be so irrational to think with the Papists, that the disciples did eat Christ's real Body, and drink his Blood, when they saw the one sitting at the table with them, and knew that the other was running in his veins, and not in the cup?"[2]

This, I suppose, is sufficient completely to prove his doctrine.

I refer next to the Exposition of the Catechism by the *Rev. James Stillingfleet,*[3] an abridgment of which has been for many years on the list of the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society.

"Q. What do you mean by their [i.e. the Body and Blood of Christ] being verily and indeed taken? &c.

"A. I mean that they who duly receive them do really and fully partake of the virtue of Christ's sacrifice, and of all the benefits of his death and resurrection.

"Q. Are all who come to the Lord's Table thus benefited?

"A. By no means; only the faithful; that is, they who receive with penitent hearts, a living faith, and holy dispositions.

[1] An Exposition, or Practical Treatise, on the Church Catechism of the Church of England, &c. By James Salter, Vicar of St. Mary-Church in Devon. Exon. 1753. 8vo.

[2] p. 167.

[3] A Short and Familiar Explanation of the Church-Catechism, confirmed by Scripture Proofs, &c. By James Stillingfleet, M.A., Rector of Hotham, Yorkshire.—It was first published about 1787, 12mo., at York. I quote from the 8th ed. York, 1801, 12mo.

"Q. But is that which we eat and drink at the Lord's Table changed into the Body and Blood of Christ?"

"A. No; what we eat and drink is *only bread and wine;* it is *inwardly in our souls that the Body and Blood of Christ are received, spiritually by faith.*"[1]

I close the list with the Exposition of Dr. Isaac Mann, Bishop of Cork and Ross,[2] which has been for more than fifty years on the list of the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society. A brief extract will suffice.

"Q. Are the bread and wine changed into the natural Body and Blood of Christ? A. No; that is impossible. *The Body of Christ is in heaven, not upon earth.*

"Q. How, then, can the Body and Blood of Christ be verily and indeed taken and received? A. They are taken and received *in a spiritual sense.*

"Q. Can they be said to be verily and indeed taken and received, when they are received only spiritually? A. Yes; for *by the devotion of the soul the worthy communicant receives all the real and true benefits of the sacrament.*"[3]

These, as far as I am aware, are all the Expositions of the Catechism, published during the first two centuries after its promulgation in its present form in 1604, which are worth referring to in this place. There are of course many others, but not, I think, by persons of note, or at least such as the Authors under review would esteem as being so; and I wish to make the selection such as they cannot object to. I therefore pass over the Expositions of many excellent men, such as Jones, Vivian, and others. Of those quoted, it will be observed that *seven* — namely, those by Archbishops Wake and Secker, Bishops Nicolson, Beveridge, and Mann, and the Rev. John Lewis and James Stillingfleet, are among the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society.

It remains for the Authors under review to point out the Expositions that favor their views.

[1] p. 72.

[2] A Familiar Exposition of the Church Catechism, in five parts, &c. By Isaac Mann, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cork and Ross.—This was first published in the latter part of the last century. The 12th ed. appeared, Dublin, 1790, 12mo. I quote from the 14th ed. Lond. 1802, 12mo., published for the C. K. Society.

[3] p. 57.

I have thus carefully examined the testimony of the authoritative Formularies of our Church on this subject, and the way in which they were interpreted among us for two centuries after their establishment, and might, if it had been necessary, have continued the review of their interpretation still further with the same result. The reader will draw his own conclusions. And as it respects the Authorities both of Church and State, the serious question arises, whether the party that has lately risen up among us, whose views are represented in the works we have been considering, are to be allowed to fashion the theology of our Church after the model set forth in those and kindred publications?

SECTION V.

Testimony of the Formularies of Secondary Authority in our Church.

I now proceed to consider the testimony of two other Formularies, which have justly been considered as of considerable authority in our Church, having certainly received the sanction of Convocation and the Sovereign, though not that of the whole Legislature,—namely, Jewel's Apology and Nowell's Catechism. I refer the reader to the Note below,[1] for a brief statement of the principal evidence in support of their claim to this character, and a notice of the erroneous statements of Archdeacon Denison regarding the latter of the two.

[1] Bishop Jewel's "Apology" is recognised in Canon 30 of the Canons of 1603, as "The Apology of the Church of England," and is quoted by Hooker (Eccl. Pol. ii. 6.) under the name of "The English Apology." Collier states, that it "was approved by the Queen, and set forth with the consent of the Bishops." (Eccl. Hist. ii. 479.) And Bishop Jewel himself, in his Reply to Harding, says, that he had the concurrence of the whole English Clergy, and that the book had the Queen's licence. It was first published in 1562, the very same year as our present Articles; and "by Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles, and four successive Archbishops, the Apology was ordered to be read and chained up in all Parish Churches throughout England and Wales." (Watt, under the name "*Jewel.*") And of this work and Nowell's Catechism, Bishop Randolph thus speaks in the Preface to his "Enchiridion:"—"My choice has been principally directed to such works as had the sanction of public authority, and which may, therefore, *be relied on as containing the final and decided opinions of our Reformers, approved of in the general by the Church at large* .... Of this kind, that is, thus publicly received, were Jewel's Apology and Nowell's Catechism, the former of which is said to have been published with the consent of the Bishops,

Thus, then, speaks Bishop Jewel, in his "Apology of the Church of England," when formally delivering the doctrine of the Church of England on the Sacraments:—

"Moreover, we allow the Sacraments of the Church, that is to

and was *always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church*, in whose name it is written; the latter had *the express sanction of Convocation* . . . . Both these works were publicly received and allowed."

Nowell's Catechism, which was first published in 1570, (an abridgment, called his Middle Catechism, appearing also in the same year,) received the express sanction of one of the Canons of 1571, which orders,—"Ludimagistri nullam docebunt Grammaticam, nisi eam quam solam Regia Majestas per omne regnum in omnibus scholis legi mandavit; *nec alium Latinum Catechismum quam qui editus est anno* 1570, quem etiam Anglicè redditum pueros qui Latine nesciunt docere volumus." The 79th Canon of 1603 also orders, that "all schoolmasters shall teach in English or Latin, as the children are able to bear, the larger or shorter Catechism heretofore *by public authority set forth*." And there are no other Catechisms to which these words can apply but Nowell's; as both Archdeacon Churton in his Life of Nowell (p. 191.), and Dr. Jacobson (Pref. to Catech.) maintain. Many other authorities may be found in Dr. Jacobson's Preface.

It has, therefore, in the precise form in which it now stands, the direct sanction of the Upper House of Convocation in 1571, and of the whole Convocation in 1603.

Moreover, with the exception of a few slight alterations, it had the sanction of the whole Convocation of 1562, by which the XXXIX Articles were agreed to, as the following historical statement will show. In a paper entitled "Certain Articles in substance desired to be granted by the Queen's Majesty," drawn up preparatory to the Synod of 1562, "composed by a secretary of the Archbishop's," and "mended and added to in some places by the Archbishop's own hand, and in some places by Bishop Grindal's," one Article was as follows:—"As there is one uniform grammar prescribed throughout the schools of the whole realm, so there may be authorized one perfect *Catechism* drawn to the bringing up of the youth in godliness in the said schools, *which book is well nigh finished by the industry of the Dean of Paul's* [Nowell]. And that the same Catechism, being once approved by the learned of the Convocation House, may be authorized to be taught also by the Universities, and to the youth wheresoever they be taught their grammar in any private men's houses." (Strype, Annals I. 1. 522.) And in another paper entitled, "General Notes of Matters to be moved by the Clergy in the next Parliament and Synod," which has "marginal notes, some writ by *the Archbishop himself*, some by others," one note is,—"First, a Catechism is to be set forth in Latin: which is already done by Mr. Dean of Paul's, and wanteth only viewing." (Ibid. 474.) Accordingly, on the 5th of February, certain Bishops were appointed as a Committee by the Upper House to examine the book called "The Catechism." (Gibson, Syn. Angl., pp. 205, 206; and see Wilk. Concil. iv. 238.) And on the following third of March, the Prolocutor and others of the Lower House "presented to the Bishops, in the name of the whole assembly of the Lower House, a book called *Catechismus Puerorum*, to which, as they affirmed, all the members of the Lower House unanimously gave their assent, and they left the book in the hands of the Bishops." (Gibson, Syn. Anglic., pp. 214, 215; and see Wilk. Concil. iv. 239.) The next we hear of

say, certain holy signs and ceremonies, which Christ would we should use, that by them he might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly confirm our faith which we have in his blood, and might seal his grace in our hearts. And those

it is in a letter from Nowell to the Secretary of State, Cecil, dated June 22, 1563, in which he says,—"That whereas the copy of the Catechism, which he caused to be written out for his honour, came to the hands of the Bishops and Clergy assembled in the late Convocation, and by reason that certain places were by their judgments altered, and that it was interlined, and somewhere blotted, he had caused it to be copied out again, and had sent it him now, *not in his own name as afore, but in the name of the Clergy of the Convocation, as their book; seeing it was by them approved and allowed.*" (Strype, Annals I. 1. 526.) From these words it appears, that Nowell had received back the Catechism from the Upper House, with the formal approval of the whole Convocation; as will be still more clearly seen from the letter written by Nowell, to Sir W. Cecil, in June 1570, on the first publication of the work, preserved in the State Paper Office, and printed among the prefatory matter to Nowell's Catechism in the Parker Society edition of it. He there states that the Catechism "was offered unto them [i. e. the Bishops], being assembled in Convocation, and by them allowed, and by the whole Clergy of the Lower Convocation House subscribed unto, as is to be seen in the copy remaining with me;" and he adds, that having then again sent it to Sir W. Cecil, and received it back from him after the lapse of more than a year, "and withal certain notes of some learned man upon it," he kept it by him until the Archbishop of Canterbury "called for it," after he had "altered many places in it, according to the notes" sent him; and finally, at the wish of the Archbishop, and his intimation of Cecil's consent to its being printed, "it came to the print at the last."

This letter accounts for the delay in the publication of the work, and also shows, that the Catechism, as published, was precisely that which had been sanctioned by Convocation, with the exception of some apparently slight alterations made in consequence of the "notes of some learned man," sent by Cecil.

We may hence judge of the correctness of Archdeacon Denison's statement (Serm. 2. p. 125. *note*), that "having never been officially promulgated by the Church of England, it has *no claim* to be considered as one of her Formularies:" and also of his own accordance with the real doctrines of the Church of England, when he tells us, that this supposed fact is "a matter of great thankfulness," as it "contains teaching which cannot be reconciled with Primitive teaching," and that "as respects the definition and account given in the Catechism of 'The Holy Catholic Church,'" "this would indeed have presented an insuperable difficulty, for it is Calvinism pure and unmixed." Nevertheless, to this "Calvinism pure and unmixed" the three Convocations of 1562, 1571, and 1603, to which we owe the foundations upon which the doctrine and discipline of our Church are based, gave their full assent; and from this fact Archdeacon Denison may judge of his own conformity to the genuine doctrine of our Church.

He is not willing, however, to allow, that the "portion of this Catechism which concerns the Holy Sacraments" "would have presented the difficulty." If this be so, it seems not quite clear why he should have given a long note to his sermon to endeavour to nullify its authority; and the reader will judge how far the extracts given from it above are consistent with his views. Jewel's Apology he does not vouchsafe to notice.

sacraments, together with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic fathers, do we call figures, signs, marks, or badges, prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories. And we make no doubt, together with the same doctors, to say, that those be certain visible words, seals of righteousness, tokens of grace; and do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's Supper there is truly given *unto the believing* the Body and Blood of the Lord, the flesh of the Son of God, which quickeneth our souls, the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, grace, truth, and life; and the Supper to be the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; by the partaking whereof we be revived, we be strengthened, and be fed unto immortality; and whereby we are joined, united, and incorporate unto Christ, that we may abide in him, and he in us. . . . . .

"We say that *Eucharistia*, the Supper of the Lord, is a sacrament, that is to wit, an evident token of the Body and Blood of Christ, wherein is set, as it were, before our eyes the death of Christ and his resurrection, and what act soever he did whilst he was in his mortal body; to the end we may give him thanks for his death and for our deliverance; and that by the often receiving of this sacrament, we may daily renew the remembrance of that matter, to the intent we, being fed with the Body and Blood of Christ, may be brought into the hope of the resurrection and of everlasting life, and may most assuredly believe that the Body and Blood of Christ doth in like manner feed our souls, as bread and wine doth feed our bodies . . . . . We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that by them Christ himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that *by faith* we verily receive his body and his blood. Yet say we not this so, as though we thought that the nature of bread and wine is clearly changed, and goeth to nothing; as many have dreamed in these later times, which yet could never agree among themselves of this their dream. For that was not Christ's meaning, that the wheaten bread should lay apart his own nature, and receive a certain new divinity; but that he might rather *change us*, and (to use Theophylactus' words) might *transform* US *into his Body*. [And he then proceeds to quote some passages from the Fathers, showing that they held the bread and wine to remain unchanged.] . . . . . And in speaking thus we mean not to abase the Lord's Supper, or to teach that it is but a cold ceremony only, and nothing to be

wrought therein (as many falsely slander us we teach). For we affirm that Christ doth truly and presently give his own self in his Sacraments; in Baptism, that we may put him on; and in his Supper, that we may eat him *by faith and spirit*, and may have everlasting life by his cross and blood. And we say not, this is done slightly and coldly, but effectually and truly. For although *we do not touch the Body of Christ with teeth and mouth*, yet we hold him fast, and eat him *by faith, by understanding, and by the spirit*. And this is no vain *faith which doth comprehend Christ;* and that is not received with cold devotion, which is received *with understanding, with faith, and with spirit*. For Christ himself altogether is so offered and given us in these mysteries, that we may certainly know we be flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones; and that Christ continueth in us, and we in him. And therefore in celebrating these mysteries, the people are to good purpose exhorted, before they come to receive the holy communion, to lift up their hearts, and to direct their minds to heaven-ward; because HE IS THERE BY WHOM WE MUST BE FULL FED AND LIVE. Cyril saith, when we come to receive these mysteries, all gross imaginations must quite be banished. The Council of Nice, as is alleged by some in Greek, plainly forbiddeth us to be basely affectioned, or bent toward the bread and wine which are set before us. And as Chrysostom very aptly writeth, we say that 'the Body of Christ is the dead carcase, and we ourselves must be the eagles:' meaning thereby, that *we must fly high, if we will come unto the Body of Christ*. 'For this table,' as Chrysostom saith, 'is a table of eagles, and not of jays.' Cyprian also, 'This bread,' saith he, 'is the food of the soul, and not the meat of the belly.' And Augustine, 'How shall I hold him,' saith he, 'which is ABSENT? *How shall I reach my hand up to heaven, to lay hold upon him that sitteth there?*' He answereth, '*Reach thither thy faith, and then thou hast laid hold on him.*'"

And further on he expressly says,—

"We affirm together with the antient fathers, that *the Body of Christ is not eaten but of the good and faithful, and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ.*"[1]

Here then we plainly see the same doctrine maintained which we have derived from the legally recognised Formularies of our

[1] Jewel's Apology of the Church of England. Works, Park. Soc. ed. vol. 3. pp. 62—64, and 92. The translation is one which had the sanction of Jewel himself, and was used by him in his "Defence of the Apology."

Church. While it is held, that Christ is really present in his Supper so as to be received by faith, and that by the bread and wine Christ himself is so given unto us as that *by faith* we receive his Body and Blood, so that the bread and wine are instruments by which, in the reception of them by the faithful, the Body and Blood of Christ are received, yet the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ is quite a *distinct* thing from the reception of the bread and wine, and only connected with it in the case of the faithful. The bread and wine are received *with the mouth;* but not so, says Jewel, the Body and Blood of Christ. *They* are received by faith. And therefore the two are not "so joined together that to receive the one is to receive the other," as the doctrine we are opposing affirms. On the contrary, Jewel distinctly maintains, that "the Body of Christ is NOT EATEN BUT OF THE GOOD AND FAITHFUL, and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ."

The same testimony is borne in Nowell's Catechism.

To the question,—"Do you say, then, that the mode of receiving the Lord's Body and Blood is by faith?" the answer is,—"Certainly."[1] And to the question,—"Do *the faithful only,* then, feed on the Body and Blood of Christ?" the reply is—"Certainly *they only;* for to whom he gives his Body, to the same he gives also life eternal."[2]

SECTION VI.

TESTIMONY OF CERTAIN WORKS THAT HAVE AT DIFFERENT TIMES RECEIVED PUBLIC SANCTION AND AUTHORITY IN OUR CHURCH.

As a further illustration of the doctrine of our Church, I would also refer the reader to three other works, which, though not now possessing any authority or formal sanction, are certainly important secondary evidences of the principles on which our Reformed Church was established.

The first of these is, the Catechism issued by Royal authority in the reign of Edward VI., upon the advice of Archbishop

[1] M. Recipiendi ergo corporis et sanguinis Dominici rationem, fide constare dicis? A. Sane.

[2] M. An ergo soli fideles corpore et sanguine Christi pascuntur? A. Soli omnino: cum quibus enim corpus suum, cum iisdem et vitam æternam, ut dixi, communicat.

Cranmer, and the approval of Bishop Ridley and the heads of the Reformed party in our Church at that period, and written by Dr. Ponet, Bishop of Winchester.[1]

Thus it speaks:—

"*Master.* What declareth and betokeneth the Supper unto us, which we solemnly use in the remembrance of the Lord? *Scholar.* The Supper (as I have showed a little before) is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ: forasmuch as the bread representeth his body, betrayed to be crucified for us; the wine standeth in stead and place of his blood, plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished, so by the body, that is, the flesh and blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life.

"*Master.* How come these things to pass? *Scholar. These things come to pass by a certain secret mean and lively working of the Spirit: when we believe that Christ hath, once for all, given up his body and blood for us,* to make a sacrifice and most pleasant offering to his heavenly Father; and also when we confess and acknowledge him our only Saviour, high Bishop, Mediator and Redeemer: to whom is due all honour and glory.

"*Master.* All this thou dost well understand. For methinketh thy meaning is: that *faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat,* full both of salvation and immortality, dealt among us by the means of the Holy Ghost. Now, sith we have entreated of the sacraments, pass forward," &c.[2]

The second work is the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum," drawn up under the guidance and direction of Cranmer, and which received its last corrections from his hands; the publication of it by authority being only prevented by the death of Edward VI. The reader will find a brief account of its history prefixed to the recent edition of it by Dr. Cardwell, Oxf. 1850, 8vo.[3]

In the portion of this work which relates to heresies, we find

[1] See Cranmer's Works, P. Soc. ed. vol. i. p. 422, and vol. ii. p. 220; and Ridley's Works, P. Soc. ed. pp. 226, 227; and Sir J. Cheke's Letter to Bullinger in "Orig. Lett. rel. to Engl. Reform." published by the Parker Society, p. 142; &c.

A Short Catechism, &c. This was first published in 1553. I quote from the P. Soc. ed. of the Liturgies of Edward VI. p. 517.

[3] It was first published 1571. 4to. The MS. of it, containing Cranmer's final corrections, is in the British Museum.

a repudiation not only of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but of what it calls the doctrine of the impanation of the Body of Christ.

Treating of the former, it says, after having urged various objections to it,—

"Denique nullam relinquimus majorem Eucharistiæ venerationem, quam baptismi et verbi Dei. Symbola vero panis et vini, nisi pium et institutum a Scripturis usum communicationis retineant, non majorem æstimationem habere volumus, quam panis et vinum habent, quæ quotidie inter nos in usu habentur." [1]

Of the latter, it speaks thus:—

"In eodem luto hærent, qui panis et vini substantiam in Eucharistia ponunt, sed *vi consecrationis per ministrum appositæ corpus et sanguinem Christi verum et naturalem adjungi putant*, et cum symbolorum naturis permisceri, et subter eas subjici, *usque adeo ut sive pii sint sive impii*, qui ad Domini mensam se admovent, verum et naturale Christi corpus, et expressum ejus sanguinem, *una cum pane et vino sumant*. Verum symbola sacramentorum quoniam *res quas significant, non intra se clausas realiter et substantialiter* (ut loquuntur) *continent;* deinde cum sacris Scripturis determinatum sit, Christum suam in cœlum humanam naturam invexisse, nec cum illa sit in terras ante tempus extremi judicii descensurus; præterea cum hæc commentitia naturalis corporis Christi præsentia nullum habeat majus momentum ad ædificationem nostræ religionis quam hæc Christi præsentia quæ fide percipitur, imo multas secum afferat quæstiones inexplicabiles, ac assertiones falsas et portentosas: *absurdam hanc doctrinam qua Christi corpus et sanguis naturaliter et substantialiter* (ut illi loquuntur) *ad Eucharistiam adrepunt, et in eam includuntur, prorsus aboleri volumus.* Peregrinum enim est, et alienum a sacris literis; deinde contrarium humanæ naturæ veritati, quam Christus assumpsit, et a conditione sacramentorum longe dissidens; postremo communis quædam sentina superstitionum multarum in Ecclesiam Dei comportatarum." [2]

The doctrine here condemned is precisely the doctrine of the Authors under review.

In another part also of the same work, when speaking of "the two natures of Christ after the resurrection," it expressly con-

[1] Reform. Leg. Eccles. De Hæres. c. 19. ed. Oxf. 1850. p. 19.
[2] Ibid. pp. 19, 20.

demns the notion of the possible multipresence of Christ's body, saying of his human nature that it is—

"Finita et descripta humani corporis terminis ac finibus, qua, postquam peccata nostra perpurgavisset, in cœlos ascendit, ibique ita sedet ad dexteram Patris, ut non ubique sit, quippe quem oportet in cœlo remanere, usque ad tempus restitutionis omnium," &c.[1]

And its description of the Eucharist is as follows :—

" Eucharistia sacramentum est, in quo cibum ex pane sumunt, et potum ex vino, qui convivæ sedent in sacra Domini mensa: cujus panis inter illos et vini communicatione obsignatur gratia Spiritus Sancti, veniaque peccatorum, ad quam ex eo perveniunt, quod fide comprehendunt et percipiunt Christi sacrosanctum corpus respectu nostræ salutis ad crucem fixum, et cruorem pro tollendis fusum nostris peccatis, ut Dei promissa palam ipsa loquuntur. Deinde etiam his illustribus signis, quæ coram cerni possunt, instruuntur, et ad confitendum adducuntur, quod Christus illos enutriat, et in illis remaneat; et ipsi vicissim in Christo collati sint. . . . Cum autem ad hæc omnia nec transubstantiatione opus sit, *nec illa quam fingere solebant reali præsentia corporis Christi*, sed potius hæc curiosa hominum inventa primum contra naturam humanam sint a Filio Dei nostra causa sumptam, deinde cum Scripturis divinis pugnent, et præterea cum universa sacramentorum ratione confligant, *ista tanquam frivola quædam somnia merito desecanda curavimus, et oblivione obruenda, præsertim cum magnum ex* ILLIS *et perniciosum agmen superstitionum in Ecclesia Dei importatum fuerit.*" [2]

The third work to which I would here refer the reader is *Bullinger's Decads,* which in 1586 was so esteemed in our Church that the Clergy were directed, by an Order of the Upper House of Convocation, sanctioned by the State, to read over one sermon in it every week, and take notes of their principal contents. I add, in a note below, the proofs of its having been thus sanctioned by public authority in our Church at that time.[3]

[1] Ibid. De summa Trinit. c. 4. pp. 2, 3.

[2] Ibid. De sacramentis, c. 4. pp. 31, 32.

[3] At the Convocation in 1586, " the Archbishop and Bishops" agreed to certain " Orders," of which the first was this :—" Every Minister having cure, and being under the degrees of Master of Art and Bachelor of Law, and not licensed to be a public preacher, shall, before the 2nd day of February next, provide a Bible and *Bullinger's Decads,* in Latin or English, and a paper-book. And shall every day read over one chapter of the Holy Scriptures; and note the principal contents thereof briefly in his paper-book. And shall *every week read over*

As all must admit, that it would be easy to quote largely from this work in opposition to the doctrine of the Authors under review, I shall content myself with very brief extracts.

"Wherefore those solemn words, 'This is my body which is broken for you;' and likewise, 'This is my blood which is shed for you,' can have none other sense than this,—This is a commemoration, memorial or remembrance, sign or sacrament of my body which is given for you. This cup, or rather the wine in the cup, signifieth or representeth unto you my blood, which was once shed for you."[1]

And having proceeded to quote various passages from the Fathers, showing that they expounded our Lord's words in this sense, the author adds,—

"But let us leave off to cite men's testimonies concerning the proper and most ancient exposition of Christ's words, 'This is my body.' Let us rather proceed to allege sound arguments out of the Scriptures, as we promised to do, thereby to prove that we must sometime of necessity depart from the letter, *and that Christ's*

one sermon in the said Decads; and note likewise the chief matters therein contained in the said paper [book]. And shall once in every quarter . . . . . *show his said notes to some preacher near adjoining*, to be assigned for that purpose." And by the second of these "Orders," the said preachers are to certify to the Archdeacon or Bishop, "who do perform the said exercises, and how they have profited therein." (Strype's Whitgift, Appendix, No. 32. iii. 194, 195. Oxf. ed. See also Wilkins's Concilia, iv. 321.) Moreover, a copy of these "Orders" was lodged with the Secretary of State in January, 1586, (1587 *new style*), the month after they were agreed upon by the Bishops, and deposited by him in the State Paper Office (where they still remain), and endorsed, "Orders for the Discipline of the Church." So that, although they may not have received the formal and written authorization of the authorities of the State, they certainly were formally brought under their notice, and received their tacit sanction. And this was one of those more important documents of which Sir Joseph Williamson, Secretary of State in the time of Charles II., had copies made for greater security. And in the title-page of the edition of 1587 are the words (not found in the previous editions), "Cum gratia et privilegio Regiæ Majestatis." And so completely were these "Orders" considered by the Archbishop to have received public sanction, that he expected that *it would be inquired into in the following Parliament, how they had been observed*, as he told the Bishops in a circular letter sent to them in November, 1588. (See Strype's Whitgift, Bk. 3, c. 20. i. 531. Oxf. ed.)

[1] Bullinger's Decads; 5th decad, 9th serm. ed. 1587. pp. 1086, 1087. I quote from the English translation, and this edition of it, because it had public sanction here, and came abroad under Royal authority.

words are accordingly, as I have said, to be expounded by a figure."[1]

He then gives the Scriptural argument for this; and points out, among other things, that the passages relating to the nature of Christ's Body after the resurrection "repugn wholly " with ubiquity, or being in every place, and the insensibility of " Christ's body: which notwithstanding must needs be granted, " if we proceed to enforce the real presence of Christ's body out " of the words of the Supper simply understood."[2]

" Although we say that he [Christ] is present with us when we celebrate the Supper, and that we communicate with him; yet nevertheless we affirm that in his body he remaineth in heaven, where he sitteth at the right hand of the Father.[3]

" Since therefore it is one and the self-same body of our Lord whereof he speaketh in both places, in the 6th of St. John and the 26th of Matthew, and the self-same is said in both places to have been delivered to the death for us, or for our life; and likewise, because there is but one means to be partaker of Christ, which is by faith in his body which was delivered and his blood shed; and finally, because it is the catholic or universal and undoubted doctrine, that Christ's flesh being bodily eaten availeth nothing, surely the things before written in the sixth chapter of John are agreeable, and do fully open the matter of the Lord's Supper. And to the intent that this yet may be the better understood, I will recite what testimonies have been always alleged in the Church out of the Holy Scriptures concerning the two kinds of eating of Christ. Christ's body is eaten and his blood drunken spiritually; it is also eaten and drunken sacramentally. The spiritual manner accomplished by faith, whereby being united to Christ, we be made partakers of all his goodness. The sacramental manner is only performed in celebrating the Lord's Supper. The spiritual eating is perpetual unto the godly, because faith is to them perpetual. They communicate with Christ both without the Supper and in the Supper, and by it they do more increase, and continue their new beginnings, as we have also showed before: and *now by adjoining of the holy action, all things are done more manifestly and plainly.* As for the unbelievers and hypocrites, with their captain Judas, they never communicate with Christ, neither before the Supper, nor in the Supper, nor after the Supper, inasmuch as they continue in

[1] Ibid. pp. 1087, 1088. [2] Ibid. p. 1091. [3] Ibid. p. 1097.

their unbelief, but they [partake] of the Lord's sacrament to their own judgment and condemnation."[1]

"Although therefore *the wicked do not eat the Lord's very body, nor drink His blood*, nevertheless they are guilty of betraying the Lord's Body and Blood, as far as in them lieth. If a rebel tread under his foot the seal or letters of the prince or magistrate, although he touch not the magistrate himself, nor tread him under his foot, yet is he said to have trodden the magistrate under his foot, and is accused not for hurting the seal or defiling the letters, but he is charged of treason, and accused for treading the prince under his feet. What marvel, then, if we hear it said, that they which do eat the Lord's bread unworthily are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ? For the bread and the mystical cup are a sacrament and seal of it."[2]

SECTION VII.

TESTIMONIES TO THE AGREEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF OUR FORMULARIES WITH THAT OF THE CONTINENTAL "REFORMED CHURCHES," AND THE EARLY NONCONFORMISTS, AND ITS OPPOSITION TO THAT OF THE PAPISTS AND LUTHERANS, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

The chief controversy in which the continental "Reformed Churches" were involved for many years after their first establishment, was, with the exception of that carried on by them against Rome, their controversy with the stricter Lutherans on the Lord's Supper. This, in fact, was the great cause of the dissensions and divisions that prevailed among the continental Protestants; the stricter Lutherans maintaining the necessity of understanding our Lord's words at the institution of the Lord's Supper in what was called their literal sense, and of holding the oral manducation of the Body and Blood of Christ really present in or with or under the bread and wine; while the "Reformed" strenuously maintained the sacramental and figurative sense of the words, and that the eating and drinking was a spiritual act—an act of the soul through faith.

Now let us see in what terms the Bishops, who took a part in the settlement of our Formularies in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, spoke of those Formularies as compared with

[1] Ibid. p. 1102. [2] Ibid. p. 1104.

the Formularies of the Reformed Churches, and the writings of their divines.

On Feb. 7, 1562, (just after the XXXIX Articles had been passed in Convocation) Bishop Jewel thus writes to Peter Martyr, then at Zurich :—

"As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and *do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth* (ne unguem quidem latum absumus a doctrina vestra)." [1]

Again, in August 1566, Dr. Grindal, then Bishop of London and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, thus writes to Bullinger :—

"We [i. e. "we who are now Bishops"] *most fully agree* (plenissime consentimus) *with your Churches and with the Confession you have lately set forth.* And we do not regret our resolution [i. e. of complying with the Queen's wish as to "a few ceremonies"]; for in the mean time, the Lord giving the increase, our Churches are enlarged and established, which under other circumstances would have become a prey to the Ecebolians, *Lutherans*, and *semi-Papists*." [2]

The Confession here referred to is the later Helvetic Confession, drawn up by H. Bullinger in 1566; of course in support of a doctrine entirely opposed to that of the Authors under review. And it may be added, that Dr. Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, writing in June 1574 to H. Bullinger, says, "That Confession of true religion which you published in 1566 is now read in English, and *in the hands of every one.*" [3]

In December 1563, Dr. Robert Horn, the Bishop of Winchester, thus writes to H. Bullinger :—

"*We have throughout England the same ecclesiastical doctrine as yourselves.*" [4]

Thus, then, did the very Bishops who had the chief hand in drawing up our Formularies testify to their agreement with the doctrine of the Reformed Churches.

Again, on the other hand, the divines of the Reformed

[1] Zurich Letters, P. S. ed. 1st Ser. p. 100; and pt. 2, p. 59.
[2] Zurich Lett. 1st Ser. p. 169, and pt. 2, p. 100.
[3] Ibid. p. 304; and pt. 2, p. 178. [4] Ibid. p. 135; and pt. 2, p 81.

Churches testified their sense of the agreement of our Formularies with theirs.

Thus, Beza, in a letter to Bishop Grindal in 1566, says,—

"We consider that your Churches agree with us in all points of doctrine."[1]

And in a letter written in 1572 to a person of some importance in England, whose name is not now known, he says:—

"As far as regards *the faith itself, or the doctrine received in England by public consent and confirmed by Royal authority*, I do not think there is any one of those who think sufficiently correctly concerning these things, who does not *embrace it as true and certain*."[2]

And at a little later period, Peter du Moulin, a celebrated divine of the French Reformed Church, thus writes:—

"I know that under pretence that the Church of England hath another form of discipline than ours is, our adversaries charge us, that our religion is diverse. But experience confuteth this accusation, for we assemble with the Englishmen in their churches, we participate together in the Holy Supper of our Lord; *the doctrine of their Confessions is wholly agreeable unto ours*."[3]

Further, as it respects the doctrine of the early Nonconformists or Puritans, many testimonies might be brought to show that they did not complain of the doctrine of our Church, as laid down in the XXXIX Articles, but only of its rites and ceremonies and discipline, and were not considered as opposing it.

Thus, Dr. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, writing to Gualter in 1573, says of the Puritans,—"The *doctrine* alone they leave untouched."[4]

And in 1587, Dr. Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, (afterwards Bishop of Oxford), says,—

"The controversies between the common adversaries [the Papists] and us are *pro aris et focis*, for matters, and that capital matters, of

[1] Beza, Ep. viii. in Tract. Theol. vol. 3. Genev. 1582. fol. p. 209.

[2] Id. Ep. lxix. ibid. p. 283.

[3] P. du Moulin, The Buckler of the Faith; or, a Defence of the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches in France. Translated into English. Lond. 1620. 4to. p. 345.

[4] Zurich Lett. 1st ser. p. 287; and pt. 2. p. 168.

the substance and life of our Christian religion; not trifles as some neutrals would bear the people in hand ..... Whereas the controversies betwixt us and our brethren [the Puritans] are matters, or rather (as they call them) but manners and forms of the Church's regiment." [1]

And the doctrinal Articles of our Church were long subscribed by the Nonconformists without scruple.

SECTION VIII.

Comparison of the expressions in our Formularies, cited by the Authors under review as favorable to their doctrine, with those of the Confessions of the Foreign Reformed Churches, and our early Nonconformists.

There is one more source from which we may obtain evidence as to the true meaning of those phrases in our Formularies which have been quoted as favorable to the doctrine of a real presence of Christ's body and blood in or under the consecrated elements, and that is the phraseology used by other Churches and Ecclesiastical Bodies at and shortly after the period of the Reformation, which were confessedly opposed to that doctrine. And it is somewhat remarkable, that it has not occurred to those modern Nonconformists who have been disposed to think that certain passages in our Formularies, particularly the Catechism, favor that doctrine, that precisely the same statements occur, not only in the Confessions of the Foreign Reformed Churches, with which they consider themselves to agree, but also in those of their own predecessors in England.

The doctrine of *a* Real Presence, and that the Body and Blood of Christ are *verily and indeed received by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper, is as strongly set forth in those Confessions, and the writings of the divines that adhered to them, as in the Formularies of the Church of England. And therefore the doctrine of *such* a presence as that which is maintained by the Romanists and the Authors under review no more follows from the statements of the latter, than from those of the former, Formularies. And it is only from the long and prevalent neglect of ecclesiastical studies, that such a doctrine has been affixed to them.

[1] Defence of Gov. establ. in Ch. of Engl. Lond. 1587. 4to. Pref. p. 3.

Thus, in the latter Confession of Helvetia, published in 1566, in which Bullinger had the principal hand, it is said,—

"Therefore the faithful do receive that which is given by the minister of the Lord, and do eat the bread of the Lord, and drink of the Lord's cup. But yet, by the working of Christ, through the Holy Ghost, *they receive also the flesh and blood of the Lord*, and do feed on them to life everlasting.[1] For the flesh and blood of Christ is true meat and drink unto everlasting life: yea, Christ himself, in that he was delivered for us, and is our Saviour, is that special thing and substance of the Supper; and therefore we suffer nothing to be put in his place."[2]

"By all which it appeareth manifestly, that by spiritual meat we *mean not any imaginary thing, but the very Body of our Lord Jesus, given to us*;[3] which yet is received of the faithful, not corporally but spiritually, by faith."[4]

Precisely similar expressions occur in the former Confession of Helvetia.

Thus, again, in the Confession of France, it is said,—

"We believe, as was said before, that as well in the Supper, as in Baptism, God doth *indeed, that is, truly and effectually, give* us whatsoever he doth there sacramentally represent:[5] and accordingly with the signs we join the true possession and fruition of that thing which is there offered unto us. Therefore we affirm, that they which do bring pure faith, as it were a certain vessel, unto the holy Supper of the Lord, do *indeed receive that which there the signs do witness*;[6] namely, that the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are no less the meat and drink of the soul, than bread and wine are the meat of the body."[7]

So the Confession of Scotland:—

"And although there is a great distance of place between his

[1] Percipiunt etiam carnem et sanguinem Domini, et pascuntur his in vitam æternam.

[2] Confess. Helvet. Poster. c. 21.—Collect. Confess. in Eccles. Reform. ed. Niemeyer. Lips. 1840. 8vo. p. 519.

[3] Ipsum Domini corpus pro nobis traditum.

[4] Ibid. pp. 520, 521.

[5] Reipsa, id est, vere et efficaciter, donare quicquid ibi sacramentaliter figurat.

[6] Vere recipere quod ibi signa testificantur.

[7] Confess. fid. Gallic. Art. 37. Coll. Conf. ed. Niemeyer, p. 338.

body now glorified in heaven, and us now mortal in this earth, nevertheless we firmly believe, that the bread which we break is the communion of his body, and the cup which we bless is the communion of his blood. So that we confess and undoubtedly believe, that the faithful, in the right use of the Lord's Supper, do so eat the Body and drink the Blood of Jesus Christ, that he dwells in them and they in him. Yea, they are so made flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, that as the Eternal Godhead gave to the flesh of Jesus Christ life and immortality, so doth his flesh and blood eaten and drunken by us confer upon us the same prerogatives." [1]

Still more apposite is the phraseology of the Belgic Confession :—

"But that Christ might figure or represent unto us this spiritual and heavenly bread, he appointed earthly and visible bread and wine for a sacrament of his body and blood, that he might testify to us by them, that as truly as we take and hold in our hands this sacrament, and *eat it with our mouth* (whereby afterwards this our life is supported), *so truly also do we* BY FAITH (*which is to our soul in the place of hand and mouth*) *receive the true Body and the true Blood of Christ*, IN OUR SOULS, for the nourishment of our spiritual life.[2] . . . . *We say, therefore, that that which is eaten is the very natural Body of Christ, and that that which is drunk is his true Blood; but the instrument or means by which we eat and drink these things is* NOT THE BODILY MOUTH, BUT OUR SPIRIT ITSELF, AND THAT BY FAITH.[3] Christ therefore always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, but does not the less on that account communicate himself to us by faith." [4]

Such quotations might easily be multiplied, but these are enough to show what was the ordinary phraseology in use at the period of the Reformation among those who, *confessedly*, utterly repudiated and contended against the doctrine of such a presence of our Lord in the Eucharist as that maintained by the Romanists and the Authors under review.

[1] Confess. Scotic. 1. c. 21.—Coll. Conf. cit. p. 353.

[2] Tam vere etiam nos fide (quæ animæ nostræ est instar et manus et oris) recipere verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi in animis nostris ad vitam spiritualem in nobis fovendam.

[3] Dicimus itaque, id quod comeditur esse ipsissimum Christi corpus naturale, et id quod bibitur verum ipsius sanguinem: at instrumentum seu medium quo hæc comedimus et bibimus non est os corporeum, sed spiritus ipse noster, idque per fidem.

[4] Confess. Belgic. Art. 35.—Coll. Conf. cit. pp. 385, 386.

I will add, however, a few extracts from the writings of Calvin himself.

One passage illustrative of the language he uses on this subject I have already given in a former part of this work;[1] and it must be recollected, that in the context of that and the passages I am about to quote, he expressly maintains that the Body of Christ is only in heaven, and not in or under the elements or received by the mouth, and not received at all by the wicked.

"I say, therefore, that in the mystery of the Supper, by the signs of bread and wine *Christ is truly delivered to us, yea, and his Body and Blood*, in which he hath fulfilled all obedience for purchasing of righteousness to us: namely, that first we should grow together into one body with him: and then being made *partakers of his substance*, we may also feel his power in the communicating of all his good things."[2]

"Because it [the sign] doth not only figure the thing which it is holily appointed to represent, as a naked and empty token, but doth also *truly deliver it indeed;* why may not the name of the thing rightly accord with it?"[3]

But this *true delivery* of the Body of Christ he considers to be made to the soul, not to the body, through the operation of the Spirit, by which he says that Christ "descendeth to us that he may truly quicken our souls with the substance of his flesh and of his blood;" and by this he maintains that our spiritual conjunction with Christ is effected, and our souls "receive food of the flesh of Christ."[4]

And hence he says elsewhere, that it is "not a bare and

[1] See pp. 568, 569 above.

[2] Dico igitur in Cœnæ mysterio per symbola panis et vini, Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeoque corpus et sanguinem ejus, in quibus omnem obedientiam pro comparanda nobis justitia adimplevit: quo scilicet primum in unum corpus cum ipso coalescamus; deinde participes substantiæ ejus facti, in bonorum omnium communicatione virtutem quoque sentiamus. Calv. Instit. iv. 17. 11. Op. ed. 1667. tom. ix. p. 367. The translation above I have purposely given from Norton's translation, Lond. 1634, fol. p. 675.

[3] Quia tamen rem cui repræsentandæ consecratum est, non figurat tantum, seu nuda et inanis tessera, sed vere etiam exhibet, cur non ejus appellatio in ipsum jure competat? Id. ib. § 21. ib. p. 371. Norton's transl. p. 682.

[4] Ut vere substantia carnis suæ et sanguinis sui animas nostras vivificet . . . ut alimentum percipiant animæ ex carne Christi. Id. ib. § 24. p. 372. Norton's transl. p. 684.

simple figure" that is given to us in the Lord's Supper, but one "conjoined to its truth and substance;" and that "the sacra- "ments of the Lord ought by no means to be separated from "their substance and truth;" that "if God can neither deceive "nor speak falsely, it follows that he in reality fulfils and affords "all the things which he there signifies: it is necessary, there- "fore, that we should *truly receive in the Supper the Body and* "*Blood of Christ*, since the Lord represents the communion of "both to us;" and "therefore it must be confessed, that if the "representation given by God in the Supper is true, the inward "substance of the sacrament is conjoined to the visible signs, "and as the bread is distributed by hand, so the Body of Christ "is communicated to us that we may be partakers of it. This "certainly, even if there was nothing else, ought abundantly to "satisfy us, when we understand that Christ gives us in the "Supper the true and proper substance of his Body and Blood."[1]

Similar expressions may be found in the treatise of Beza, "On the Supper of the Lord," against Westfalus.

And hence it is justly said by Calvin,—after he has observed that "they are far deceived, which conceive no *presence of the* "*flesh of Christ* in the Supper, unless it be made present in "bread; for so they leave nothing to the secret working of the "Spirit, which uniteth Christ Himself unto us," that—"*therefore* "*the question is* ONLY OF THE MANNER: because they place "Christ in the bread, but we think it not lawful for us to pluck "him out of heaven."[2]

From these passages we may see the nature of the language

[1] Ita tamen ut non sit figura nuda et simplex, sed veritati suæ et substantiæ conjuncta. . . . . Sacramenta Domini nullo modo a substantia et veritate sua separari oportere. . . . Quod si Deus nec fallere nec mentiri potest, consequens est, ipsum omnia quæ illic significat reipsa implere ac præstare. Necesse est igitur, nos in Cœna vere corpus et sanguinem Christi recipere, quum utriusque communionem nobis Dominus repræsentet. . . . Itaque fatendum est, si vera sit repræsentatio quam adhibet Deus in Cœna, substantiam interiorem sacramenti visibilibus signis conjunctam esse, et quemadmodum panis in manu distribuitur, ita corpus Christi, ut ejus participes simus, nobis communicari. Hoc certe, etiam si nihil aliud esset, nobis abunde satisfacere deberet; quum intelligimus, Christum nobis in Cœna veram propriamque corporis et sanguinis sui substantiam donare. CALVINI De Cœna Domini. Op. ed. 1667. tom. viii. p. 3.

[2] Ergo tantum de modo quæstio est: quia Christum ipsi in pane locant, nobis autem non ducimus fas esse eum a cœlo detrahere. CALV. Instit. iv. 17. 31. Op. ix. 375. Norton's transl. p. 690.

used by many who utterly denied and repudiated the doctrine of the Authors under review. They spoke freely even of the Body and Blood of Christ being *conjoined to the signs*, IN THE SENSE of those signs being, *to the faithful*, means and instruments by which they are made partakers of that Body and Blood; and of there being a *real presence* of Christ's Body and Blood and *participation* of them by the faithful; *as real* as, and in fact *more real* than, the doctrine of a presence of them in the elements to be swallowed by the mouth would imply; and therefore that the only question was as to "*the manner*" of the presence.

In fact, it is clear, that the gift to the soul of spiritual conjunction and communion with Christ's human nature is a far more real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ to the soul than can be produced by the mere swallowing the Body and Blood of Christ into the stomach. The latter is, in truth, *no real presence to the soul*, because it is admitted, that the soul is no more affected by the mere oral reception of the Body and Blood of Christ, than if that Body and Blood remained in heaven.

It is not, therefore, by the mere use of certain phrases that the doctrine of any Church or divine can be ascertained, but by the *sense* in which those phrases are applied.

Moreover, not only is this phraseology to be found in the Confessions of the foreign Reformed Churches and the writings of their divines, but in the Formularies issued by the early Puritans among ourselves as agreed upon at the famous Assembly of divines at Westminster in the time of the Commonwealth. The Confession of Faith, the Catechism, and the Directory put forth by this Assembly, all use expressions of the same kind as those which are now sometimes cited from the Formularies of the Church of England as showing her maintenance of the doctrine of the Real Presence in or under the elements.

Thus speaks the Westminster Confession of faith:—

"The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that *truly*, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes *called by the name of the things they represent*, to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ;

albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before." . . . . "Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, REALLY AND INDEED, yet not carnally and corporally, but *spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified*, and all benefits of his death: the Body and Blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as REALLY, but *spiritually*, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses." "Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby: but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, to their own damnation." [1]

Thus also speaks "The Larger Catechism," published by the same body:—

"Q. 170. How do they that worthily communicate in the Lord's Supper feed upon the Body and Blood of Christ therein?

"A. As the Body and Blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally present in, with, or under the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and yet are spiritually present to the faith of the receiver, *no less truly and really than the elements themselves are to their outward senses;* so they that worthily communicate in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do therein *feed upon the Body and Blood of Christ*, not after a corporal and carnal, but in a spiritual manner; yet TRULY AND REALLY, while by faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ crucified and all the benefits of his death." [2]

The very words of our Catechism, which are more especially urged for the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in or under the elements, are here freely and voluntarily used by the early Nonconformists for the expression of their own views.

Further, we must not omit to add the language of "The Directory for the Public Worship of God," put forth by the same Assembly.

[1] Confess. of Faith by Assembly of Divines at Westminster, c. xxix. art. 5, 7, 8. I quote from an ed. published at Edinb. 1827, 12mo. pp. 164, 165.

[2] The Larger Catechism, by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. I quote from the ed. published at Edinb. 1827, 12mo. (with the Confession just cited) pp. 363, 364.

In the first place, they distinctly intimate that the bread and wine, after consecration, are not to be considered as common elements, declaring that "the minister is to begin the action "with sanctifying and blessing the elements of bread and wine "set before him . . . . having first, in a few words, showed that "those elements, *otherwise common, are now set apart and "sanctified* to this holy use by the word of institution and "prayer."[1] And after the prayer of consecration, it is said,— "The elements being now sanctified by the word and prayer, "the minister," &c.[2]

And in "The Prayer, thanksgiving or blessing of the bread and wine," it is said, that by this sacrament "Christ and all his benefits are applied and sealed up unto us," and God is entreated "so to sanctify these elements both of bread and wine, and to "bless his own ordinance, that we may *receive by faith the Body "and Blood of Jesus Christ,* crucified for us, and so to feed "upon him, that he may be one with us, and we one with him; "that he may live in us, and we in him,"[3] &c.

And on the delivery of the bread, the words to be used are, "Take ye, eat ye; *this is the Body of Christ which is broken for "you:* do this in remembrance of him."[4]

There could not, I conceive, be more conclusive evidence that the use of such phrases does not in the slightest degree imply the maintenance of such doctrine as that of the Authors under review.

The misconception under which the Authors under review appear to labor is, that there is no medium between holding *their* doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, and maintaining that there is only in that rite a mere exercise of faith in Christ's sacrifice. A more remarkable and groundless misconception could not exist. The real doctrine which they have to meet is this:—That the elements after consecration are holy, and that they are not mere inoperative and inefficacious signs, but that through the Divine appointment and blessing they are means and instruments through the reception of which God

[1] The Directory, &c. I quote from the ed. published with the Confession and Catechism just quoted, p. 544.

[2] Ibid. p. 545. [3] Ibid. p. 545. [4] Ibid. p. 545.

gives to the faithful recipient the things themselves of which they are the signs; but that while the signs are given by man to *the mouth*, the things signified are given by God to *the soul;* and are *as verily and indeed* given to and received by the soul as the signs are given to and received by the body; but of course in that *spiritual manner* which is suitable for such a communication, which differs altogether from the *manner* in which a thing is given to and received by the bodily mouth.

On the nature and effects of that spiritual reception this is not the place to enlarge. Nor indeed are we able in this world to do more on such a subject than, as it were, to "see through a glass darkly." The nature of that spiritual union which exists between Christ and his Church was, even to the Apostle, a "great mystery." But that it is a real union, Scripture assures us. And the union is illustrated by that which takes place in the case of food received into the body. The power and virtue of the food are absorbed into the system and become one with it, influencing both the body and the soul. Thus also does the soul become in a spiritual way one with Christ, and hence both a partaker of the Divine gifts and spiritual influences with which the human nature of Christ is endowed through its union with the Godhead, and interested in the blessings and privileges purchased by the sufferings and death of Christ for all who are thus made one with him; and thus derives from Christ its spiritual nourishment. Notwithstanding the distance of place between the human nature of Christ and the believer, there is, through the operation of the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christ, a spiritual *presence, conjunction,* and *communion* as real as if there was bodily contact.

Before I proceed to the next chapter, it may be well to add here a supplementary notice to the works on the Articles quoted in pp. 665—687 above. A comparatively recent Commentary on the Articles, written by Dr. Hey, Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge at the latter part of the last century, has been referred to in vindication of Archdeacon Denison.

The following extracts may serve to show what Dr. Hey's views really are.

I quote, first from his Commentary on Art. 28.

Speaking of the doctrine of the Council of Trent respecting the Eucharist, he says that the Council "declares that there is "no contradiction between Christ's body being always naturally "at the right hand of God, and sacramentally in other places:" which is precisely the doctrine of the Authors under review; and he adds this remark, "*Where ideas are wanting, how useful "are words!* Yet such manner of existence, we are told, is not "expressible by words, but is possible to God." [1]

"In Art. XXIX. those who take the Lord's Supper, are said to 'eat and drink the *sign* or *sacrament* of so great a thing' (as the Body and Blood of Christ.) From this comparison it appears, that 'Sacrament' in our Article means much the same as 'sign'; which agrees with the account before given of the most literal or proper signification of the word Sacrament." [2]

"The Article [Art. XXVIII.] seems to contain six propositions. (1) The Lord's Supper has an external part or sign. (2) It has an internal part, or spiritual grace; *that is, it denotes or represents our redemption by the death of Christ.*" [3]

These words clearly show what a different view Dr. Hey took of the "internal part" from what the Authors under review do.

"In John vi., Christ ascribes the same effects to eating the *Bread* of *Life*, and to eating his *Flesh:* and the Papists own John vi. to belong to the sacrament: Christ's Body may therefore as properly be *bread*, as *flesh;* but eating the *Bread of Life* and eating *Christ's flesh* must be both proper, or both figurative expressions; they cannot be both literal, therefore they are *both figurative.*" [4]

"The Body of Christ is, in the Lord's Supper, eaten spiritually by faith. The arguments just now used must tend to prove this; the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is eaten in *some* sense; if not *really*, it must be *spiritually.*" [5]

"Conceive it [the Lord's Supper] as a feast on a sacrifice, and all is easy and simple. We, indeed, are not in the habit of sacrificing;

[1] Hey's Lectures in Divinity. 2nd ed. Cambr. 1822. vol iv. p. 326.
[2] Ibid. p. 335. [3] Ibid. p. 343. [4] Ibid. p. 345. [5] Ibid. pp. 345, 6.

but what is that? Who could not understand, that when sacrifices were in use, part of the victim was served up at a religious feast; and all who partook of the material feast were understood to partake of the spiritual benefits of the sacrifice? Christ was our victim; *on his Body we do not feast literally, because it is in Heaven;* but he *appointed bread to represent it;* on that we can feast, and so partake of his Body; that is, feast upon the Victim. Such bread is '*the Bread of Life*,' because, by his own appointment, it *represents his Flesh*." [1]

"Their [i. e. the Romanists] chief argument lies in the words, 'This is my Body;' plain words, as they contend; Archdeacon Sharp *rightly replies*, yes, they are plain words, for they are a very *plain figure. Many exceptions may be taken to their being used in a literal sense;* but I shall content myself with the context. If the bread in the hand of Christ was literally his Body, what was the cup?—'This cup is the New Testament in my blood.' Was the cup a Testament? Was the cup in Christ's blood? And if we may not take words figuratively, was Christ really and literally a Vine and a Door?" [2]

"It is idle to use words and by limitations to take away their customary meaning. As words are arbitrary signs, they depend for their meaning on custom wholly. What signifies talking of a Body, not present as to place? *That which is not present in such a sense as to occupy a place, is not Body, in human language.* And so that which is without the qualities or accidents of substances is no substance: man has no idea of such a thing: nor could the notion have been admitted in any but an ignorant age." [3]

This passage is altogether fatal to the fundamental principle on which the doctrine of the Authors under review rests.

Again, in his Commentary on Art. XXIX., he says,—

"'The wicked,' who eat 'to their condemnation,' are the *decidedly* wicked, the abandoned, 'such as be void of a lively faith.' *The meaning is, to oppose the notion, that a man eats the Body of Christ how wicked soever he be.*" [4]

This is precisely what we maintain to be the meaning of the Article.

[1] Ibid. pp. 348, 9. [2] Ibib. pp. 349, 350. [3] Ibid. pp. 352, 3.
[4] Ibid. p. 357.

"*We say* [*i. e.* we of the Church of England] that the bread continues bread after consecration, and therefore that every receiver eats bread; but that he who does what the Scripture requires, may be said, in the prophetic, strong, figurative language of Scripture, to eatt he Body of Christ; as he eats what is appointed to *represent* that Body, and what the Scripture calls briefly that Body itself." [1]

These passages show beyond contradiction, not merely what he himself held, but what he believed to be the doctrine of the Church of England. And this surely is what we have to look to, so far as his authority is concerned, for the sense in which the Articles should be signed.

No doubt, in other parts of his Commentary on Art. 28 and 29, he has endeavored to show, that the Romanists might use the words of Art. 28 and 29 (except those expressly referring to Transubstantiation) in a sense which would make them agreeable to their doctrine. But he admits that this sense would presuppose a doctrine which is not that of the Church of England, which seems equivalent to admitting that this sense is excluded to one who is bound by the doctrine of the Church of England.

Thus on Art. XXIX, he says,—

"Du Pin says that the Body and Blood of Christ 'are truly and really received by *all*, though none but the *faithful* partake of any *benefit* from them.' What can we dispute here? The former part of his affirmation is true, *upon his supposition* of transubstantiation; but that we think false; yet we might use the same *words* WITH A DIFFERENT IDEA. The latter part agrees with our opinions. The former is the same thing as if he had said, '*Supposing* transubstantiation, the Body and Blood of Christ are received by all communicants.' This could not be disputed." [2]

Du Pin's words express exactly the doctrine of the Authors under review, understood in the sense in which Du Pin used them, and this sense is founded on that notion of a real presence (for the word "transubstantiation" is here used with reference merely to its implying a real substantial presence of the Body) which "we think false." But yet we might use the same words with a different idea attached to them, for, under-

[1] Ibid. p. 358. [2] Ibid. p. 359.

standing the signs to be called by the names of the things signified, we might say that the Body and Blood of Christ are received by all. This however, *if admitted,* would not show, that a person holding that doctrine of the real presence which is held both by the Romanists and the Authors under review, could properly sign the Article for the purpose of ministering in our Church, for no Minister of our Church ought to give to the words of the Article a meaning founded upon a doctrine repudiated by the Church of England.

Dr. Hey evidently *identifies* the notion of eating the true body of Christ with deriving certain benefits from Christ. The one is, with him, equivalent to the other. He recognises only two modes of receiving the Body and Blood of Christ—one a reception of them symbolically, and the other a reception that benefits the recipient. And therefore while he maintains with us, that "the meaning" of Article XXIX. "is to oppose the notion, that a man eats the Body of Christ how wicked soever he be," he says at the same time that we have in it "but one proposition," which is, "Christians do not get the benefits *annexed* to what in Scripture is called eating the Body of Christ merely by partaking of the Lord's Supper." [1]

But Archdeacon Denison, with the Romanists, repudiating a symbolical reception as no reception at all, holds that there is a real reception by even the wicked unaccompanied with benefit, and also a real reception by the faithful, producing a saving effect; and he therefore cannot avail himself of Dr. Hey's interpretation of the Article, because Dr. Hey expressly admits, that the object of the Article is "to oppose the notion, that a man eats the Body of Christ how wicked soever he be," which is precisely the doctrine of the Archdeacon.

The words of Dr. Hey, on Article XXIX., will be found to apply not to the case of a Minister of our Church subscribing the Article, but to the difference between the Romanists and our Church. And Dr. Hey, looking only to the *phrase* as to the wicked eating or not eating the Body of Christ, says that "the dispute between the Romanists and the Reformed is merely verbal," and that as the phrase is used in two different senses, "to dispute about

[1] Ibid. p. 357.

its truth is idle and childish." But this is merely to reproach our Church for inserting such an Article in her Confession.

With respect to the extracts from Bishop Ken's "Exposition on the Catechism," in p. 708 above, I would observe here, that no particular edition of the work is mentioned in the Catena there animadverted upon; but as the work was first published in 1685, and the revised edition in which the passage was altered in 1686, and all the subsequent impressions followed the revised edition, the passage as quoted in the Catena must have been taken from an edition previous to the revised edition of 1686, and certainly the passage stands in an edition of 1685 which I possess, in the form in which I have given it. If there is any other edition of 1685 which gives the passage in the form in which it is given in the Catena, it would be well for the compilers of the Catena to say where a copy is to be found. Certainly, there *may* be. But even if there is, it is almost impossible that the compilers of the Catena should have been ignorant of the fact that the passage was almost immediately altered by Bishop Ken himself, as I have pointed out in p. 709; and therefore even in that case their Catena lies under the same reproach.

I observe that an attempt has been made to affix to the words "the faithful" in that portion of the Catechism commented upon in pp. 668 et seq. above, the meaning of *all baptized Christians* as distinguished from *the heathen*. To this, indeed, Archdeacon Denison himself alludes in his Sermon; but as he declined to "insist" upon it, I did not think it worth while to detain the reader to discuss it. In reply to such an argument, I think it sufficient to point out, that all the numerous Commentaries on the Catechism that have ever been written by Archbishops, Bishops, and Divines of all views and parties, have agreed in interpreting the words as referring to true believers; and also that (as I have pointed out already) the latter part of the Catechism is merely a revision of Dean Nowell's third or smallest Catechism, and what he meant by the phrase is evident from the extract given a few pages above[1] from his larger Catechism.

It has been also attempted to show, that the word "sign," in Art. XXIX., must mean *sign with the thing signified joined to it,*

[1] See p. 732 above.

because in Art. XXV., sacraments are called "effectual signs of grace," and it was observed that in the Latin Article the words were "sacramentum seu *symbolum*," and a meaning was attributed to the word *symbolum* suitable to the purpose of the argument. But, having thus out of fairness mentioned the argument, I leave it with the reader. It would be a positive waste of time to discuss it.

While noticing the *Latin* Art. XXIX., I may here add, that the Latin title is stronger than the English in opposition to Archdeacon Denison's view, for it runs thus:—"*De manducatione corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare.* The former part of this sentence clearly is not limited to the sense of eating *unto life*; neither therefore is the latter.

CHAPTER VII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE DIVINES OF OUR CHURCH ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK; SHOWING THEIR UNQUALIFIED REJECTION OF THE DOCTRINE OF A REAL PRESENCE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, EVEN IN A SUPERNATURAL MODE OF EXISTENCE, OR A SPIRITUAL AND IMMATERIAL FORM, IN OR UNDER THE CONSECRATED BREAD AND WINE, OR UNDER THEIR FORMS.

SECTION I.

Preliminary Remarks.

I now proceed to adduce the testimonies of the divines of our Church on the doctrine of the nature of our Lord's presence in the Eucharist. And I must here again remind the reader, that the question at issue is not as to whether there is *a Real Presence* of Christ's Body and Blood to the faithful communicant in the Lord's Supper, but of *what nature* that presence is. Some of those who have most earnestly *opposed* that doctrine of the Real Presence which is maintained by the Authors under review, have most strenuously insisted upon there being *a Real Presence* of Christ's Body and Blood to the believer. Thus, for instance, Bishop Jeremy Taylor has left us a treatise on the "*Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament,*" and has on that account been cited by the party of the Authors under review as a witness in their favor, while his treatise is in fact written for the special purpose of *refuting* such a doctrine of the Real Presence as they are contending for.

Had Archdeacon Denison really *read* such works as this of Bishop Taylor, instead of catching at a few words and phrases,

he never could have given, as consistent with the doctrine of our English divines, such an interpretation of the phrase "spiritual food" as we find in his second Sermon,[1] where he, in fact, makes it equivalent to *food of an immaterial kind.*

One great point for which our divines have contended in opposition to Romish errors, has been the *reality* of that presence of Christ's Body and Blood to the soul of the believer which is effected through the operation of the Holy Spirit, notwithstanding the *absence* of the substance of that Body and Blood in heaven. Like the sun, the Body of Christ is both *present* and *absent:* present, really and truly present, in one sense; that is, by the soul being brought into immediate communion with it; but absent in another sense, that is, as regards the contiguity of its substance to our bodies. The Authors under review, like the Romanists, maintain that this is not a real presence; and, assuming their own interpretation of the phrase to be the only true one, press into their service the testimony of divines who, though using the phrase, apply it in a sense the reverse of theirs.

The ambiguity of the phrase, and its misapplication by the Church of Rome, have induced many of our divines to repudiate it; and our Church, as Dean Aldrich has observed,[2] has wisely forborne its use; but others, for the similar purpose of preventing misconception and meeting the misrepresentations of the Romanists, have maintained and contended for its use.

The real doctrine of our divines, therefore, is not to be sought in their use or rejection of this phrase, but in the meaning they attach to it, and their accompanying statements.

And I may here observe, that there is a *third* sense in which the phrase *real presence of Christ's Body and Blood* has been used, namely, by those who have held that the virtue of Christ's Body and Blood is so imparted to the bread and wine, that they may be considered as being, on that account, Christ's Body and Blood, as endued with the same power and producing the same effects. The chief supporters of this notion among us are to be found among the Nonjurors; as, for instance, Brett and Johnson.[3] A notion somewhat similar to this was advocated by

[1] Archdeacon Denison, Serm. 2. p. 98. [2] See pp. 36—40, above.

[3] John Johnson, though not strictly speaking a Nonjuror, was a strong favorer of that party, and is usually reckoned among them.

Dr. Pelling and Dr. H. More. And the passages in their works, maintaining a presence *of this kind* in the elements, though such a notion is *totally different* from the doctrine maintained by the Authors under review and their party, and in fact formally repudiated by Archdeacon Wilberforce, are paraded in the Tractarian Catenas on this subject, with their usual disregard to accuracy, as proofs that their Authors held the doctrine of a Real Presence of the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ in a supernatural way, in or with or under the consecrated elements.

And nothing can more fully show the miserable confusion and inaccuracy that prevail in the works we are reviewing, than the fact, that while Archdeacon Wilberforce charges Johnson with *denying* that the *res sacramenti* is the true body of Christ, and imagining "that a *new* body is formed for our Lord out of bread and wine, by the power of the Holy Ghost," a notion which he thinks "subversive of the whole economy of the Gospel,"[1] (but which is a misrepresentation of Johnson's theory,) the Catena which Archdeacon Denison appropriates for his defence, quotes largely from Johnson, as a witness for the real presence of Christ's true body in or under the consecrated elements.

As I have already made some remarks on this doctrine of a virtual presence in the elements, I shall not here enlarge upon it; but merely point out, as they come under our notice, those Authors who have maintained it, who have been misquoted in the Tractarian Catenas as supporters of such doctrine as that of the Authors under review.

The testimonies which I am now about to quote from the divines of our Church will be directed to the proof of their doctrine on these two points:—

First, That the Body and Blood of Christ are not present in or under the bread and wine, or under their forms, and are not joined to the bread and wine by any union such that when the minister gives the latter, the former are necessarily received with them.

Secondly, That the wicked do not eat or receive the real Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

[1] Doctrine of Euch. ch. x. p. 312.

These two propositions, it will be observed, may be proved not merely by their being treated of directly, but quite as fully by general statements of doctrine, as for instance by the assertion that the words of institution are to be understood in a figurative sense, which of course determines of itself the doctrine held on both these points.

In making the following extracts, the only difficulty has been in selecting, from so large a number, the particular Authors who should be taken as the representatives of the English clergy on this subject. In order, therefore, to prevent the possibility of objection, I have rested my proof on the testimony of the very divines who are referred to on the opposite side; particularly of those quoted in the Catena[1] lately published on this subject, *which has been adopted by Archdeacon Denison in his public defence of his cause*[2] *as setting forth the principal authorities in his favor among our divines.* A few other authors were also quoted on Archdeacon Denison's trial as having maintained the same views with him, whose case I shall also consider. In what position an examination even of those authorities (the most favorable that could be found to the views here controverted), places the case of Archdeacon Denison, I shall leave the reader to decide. Of course the argument might have been rendered much stronger by the addition of other witnesses. But this seemed unnecessary.

Before I proceed to give the extracts, there is another remark which I must beg to offer. It has been alleged, that even if the Authors referred to have in other parts of their works maintained a doctrine opposed to that of Archdeacon Denison, it only proves that they have contradicted themselves. But the reader will observe, that, in the subject before us, it is more especially true, that the meaning in which an author has used certain phrases *can only be ascertained* by his language in the context, or in other parts of his works. For instance, in the very point more particularly under discussion in the case of Archdeacon Denison, namely, whether the wicked do or do not

[1] The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as set forth in the works of Divines and others of the English Church since the Reformation. Part I. and II. Oxf. and Lond. 1855. 8vo.

[2] This was done, both in his Defence before the Commissioners at Clevedon, and again at his trial before the Archbishop of Canterbury at Bath, July 22-26., 1856.

eat the Body of Christ, an author might appear to an unlearned reader directly to contradict himself without there being the slightest self-contradiction. For, the phrase *Body of Christ* being used in two different senses, he might seem both to affirm and deny the above proposition, as will be found to be frequently the case. Speaking of the consecrated elements under the names of the things they represent, (the signs being, as we have so often had occasion to observe, called by the names of the things signified,) he might freely speak of the wicked eating the Body of Christ; while again, when speaking of the manducation of the real Body of Christ, he might earnestly deny that the wicked eat the Body of Christ. *And the meaning in which he used the former expression could only be determined by the language he used on the latter point.*

The apparent self-contradiction would only arise from the reader's ignorance of the subject.

And it may be added, that the extracts given below will almost all be found to be taken from the very *same works* from which the extracts in the Catena are made.

How far Archdeacon Denison himself appears to have been acquainted with the subject when he wrote his Sermons, I have already pointed out,[1] and therefore shall add no more on that point here. But we shall there, I think, find the true reason for his accusing our divines of "uncertainty or indistinctness of theological statement."

It appears, that in his Defence on his trial before the Archbishop of Canterbury, it was again urged as showing the difference between his doctrine and that of Rome, that he does not maintain a *material* presence; and attention was drawn to the fact that in the third edition of his sermons he has, in p. 38, added to the words, "real spiritual presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine," the following note,—"Having been advised that the use of the word '*in*' "in this context, though not uncommon in the writings of our "own divines, might appear to some to savour of some *material* "presence, I have carefully avoided such use in my further "statements and arguments."

[1] See pp. 592—594 above.

But this only shows his want of acquaintance with the subject. *No one* holds a *material* presence; the Romanists as little as himself; nor is he charged with holding a material presence. But his primary blunder of confounding *the spiritual presence of Christ's body* to the faithful communicant in the Lord's Supper, which our divines maintain, with *the presence of Christ's body in the form of a spirit* in or under the form of the consecrated elements, which the Romanists maintain and our divines deny, seems to lead him to imagine, in the very face of direct evidence to the contrary, that the charge against him *must be* for holding a *material* presence; or perhaps I should rather say, the defence against such a charge is found easier than a vindication against the real ground of complaint.

I must again, therefore, caution the reader, before he proceeds to the extracts from our divines, against allowing himself to be misled as to the nature of the charge brought against Archdeacon Denison.

The attempt made by Archdeacon Denison's Counsel to exculpate him from the charge of maintaining that the Body and Blood of Christ are received *orally* by the communicant, I must treat as the professional plea of the Advocate, not the argument of the Archdeacon. After all his statements on the subject, especially the one to which I have alluded in pp. 657, 658 above,—after his reference to Archdeacon Wilberforce's work as giving his own view on the subject,—after his publication of the work of Saravia, as precisely setting forth his doctrine, in which, as I have already shown,[1] the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ *by the mouth* is repeatedly insisted upon, it would be painful to suppose that the Archdeacon could himself advance such a plea.[2]

What the Archdeacon's doctrine really is, may be judged by the fact, that though he denies that he holds the doctrine of Consubstantiation, he expressly referred by his Advocate to the original Confession of Augsburg as maintaining his doctrine in that sense of the Confession which the stricter Lutheran

[1] See pp. 229, 230 above.

[2] I might add, that in the very Catena formally put in as a document for his defence, the very words are quoted with approbation,—"*All* eat the flesh of Christ *orally*." (p. 8.)

divines put upon it. Now, though it is quite true, that by giving a certain interpretation to the word Consubstantiation the Archdeacon may, *like the Lutheran divines themselves*, (as I have already pointed out,[1]) deny that he holds the doctrine of Consubstantiation, it is undeniable that he holds that doctrine which our divines have repudiated under the name of Consubstantiation, for they gave the name of Consubstantiation to the doctrine which was held by the more strict Lutheran divines. And this is all with which we are concerned. Our divines did not charge the Lutherans with maintaining that the two substances, the bread and the body of Christ, were *blended* into *one* substance, but that they formed, in a state of conjunction, the sacrament lying on the table, and this doctrine (which is precisely the doctrine of the Authors under review) they maintained to be erroneous; and as we shall almost immediately see, Bishop Ridley, in 1555, expressed his belief that there was not a man of any learning in England that maintained it.

Reference has been made, in defence of Archdeacon Denison's right to maintain and inculcate the doctrine he holds, to the "Gorham Judgment;" and it has been asserted, that the principle of that Judgment was this,—that as a great number of our divines in former times maintained the same doctrine as Mr. Gorham, therefore Mr. Gorham could not be fairly prohibited from maintaining it, notwithstanding its opposition to the Formularies of our Church; and consequently, that even if Archdeacon Denison's doctrine is not reconcileable with the Articles, yet as a host of our divines have taught the same doctrine, he is equally at liberty to teach it. This argument is founded upon two serious and remarkable misrepresentations. For neither did the "Gorham Judgment" proceed upon the principle here ascribed to it, nor did the divines of our Church, referred to as witnesses in vindication of Archdeacon Denison, hold his doctrine. The latter misrepresentation we are just about fully to examine; but before we proceed to do so, it is well that the reader should understand upon what grounds the Gorham Judgment rested. Now the principle of that Judgment

[1] See pp. 231, 232 above.

is thus clearly laid down by the Judges themselves in the course of it :—

"These being, as we collect them, the opinions of Mr. Gorham, the question which we have to decide is, not whether they are theologically sound or unsound—not whether upon some of the doctrines comprised in the opinions, other opinions opposite to them may or may not be held with equal or even greater reason by other learned and pious ministers of the Church ; but *whether these opinions now under our consideration are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England, by its Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, requires to be held by its ministers*, so that upon the ground of those opinions the appellant can lawfully be excluded from the benefice to which he has been presented. THIS QUESTION MUST BE DECIDED BY THE ARTICLES AND THE LITURGY ; *and we must apply to the construction of those books the same rules which have been long established, and are by law applicable to the construction of all written instruments.* We must endeavour to attain for ourselves *the true meaning of the language employed*, assisted only by the consideration of such external or historical facts as we may find necessary to enable us to understand the subject-matter to which the instruments relate, and the meaning of the words employed."[1]

Such is the principle expressly laid down by them as the ground upon which their Judgment rested, and they add, that in considering the Articles and Liturgy—"We are not to be in "any way influenced by the particular opinions of the eminent "men who propounded or discussed them, or by the authorities "by which they may be supposed to have been influenced, or "by any supposed tendency to give preponderance to Calvinistic "or Arminian doctrines."[2]

Then follows a careful examination of the various Formularies of our Church, in the course of which it is pointed out, that there is nothing in Mr. Gorham's doctrine which is opposed to them, and on the contrary that, in the very Formulary more particularly urged against him, the principle of interpretation he was blamed for adopting with regard to the Baptismal Service *must* be adopted in *other* Services contained in that very same Book.

And having thus come to the conclusion, founded upon an independent examination of the Formularies themselves, that

[1] Moore's Gorham Case, 1852. 8vo, p. 462. [2] Ibid. p. 463.

Mr. Gorham's doctrine was *not repugnant* to the doctrine of the Church of England as there laid down, they add this notice of the divines that had been referred to as maintaining the same doctrine :—

"In the examination of this case, we have NOT RELIED *upon the doctrinal opinions of any of the eminent writers by whose piety, learning, and ability the Church of England has been distinguished;* but it appears that opinions, which we cannot in any important particular distinguish from those entertained by Mr. Gorham, have been propounded and maintained, without censure or reproach, by many eminent and illustrious prelates and divines who have adorned the Church from the time when the Articles were first established."[1]

The Judges, it will be observed, distinctly disclaim resting their Judgment, in any way or degree, upon the opinions of divines on the subject, but place it entirely upon the testimony of the Formularies themselves.

And having proceeded to cite some of the divines who had been referred to, they draw from their statements merely this conclusion; that "the mere fact that such opinions have been "propounded and maintained by persons so eminent and so "much respected, as well as by very many others, appears to "us sufficiently to prove, that the liberty which WAS LEFT BY "THE ARTICLES AND FORMULARIES has been *actually enjoyed* "*and exercised* by the members and ministers of the Church of "England."[2]

They expressly maintain, it will be observed, that the liberty "*was left by the Articles and Formularies.*"

Now the case of Archdeacon Denison is simply this. He is charged with maintaining a doctrine which is contrary to the doctrine of the Formularies of our Church, and expressly and directly condemned in the XXXIX. Articles. According, then, to the principle of the Gorham Judgment, this charge must be dealt with by an examination of the Formularies themselves, especially the XXXIX. Articles, independently of opinions that may have been maintained by some of the divines of our Church.

It is *also*, however, alleged against him, that the divines to whom he and his defenders have referred as maintaining his doctrine, are, as a body, and as it respects all who are of any

[1] Ibid. p. 472. [2] Ibid. p. 474.

moment among them, as much opposed to him as the Articles; to the proof of which allegation I shall now proceed.

SECTION II.

EXTRACTS FROM DIVINES WHO FLOURISHED DURING THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

Of the divines of this period three only have been referred to as maintainers of the doctrine of the Authors under review,—Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, and Bishop Ponet.[1] The very citation of the two former will at once show those acquainted with their works, what degree of credit is due to the Catena in question. I am quite willing to allow, that the Compiler of the Catena may have been so wanting in clear views of the nature of the Eucharist, and so little acquainted with the character of the controversies on the subject, as to misapprehend the real meaning of much that he has quoted, and to be unconscious how necessary it is to ascertain from the context, and other passages in the works from which he was quoting, what is the sense in which the extracts he has given are to be understood. I cannot, however, admit that the Compiler is on this ground capable of justification, and still less those who have used his labors, because the real views of almost all the Authors he has quoted are so palpably and undeniably opposed to the doctrine for the maintenance of which he quotes them, even as expressed in the very works from which the extracts are taken, that no man exercising ordinary care and attention could make any mistake in the matter. In fact, the attempt to delude the public into the belief that the Authors referred to maintained the doctrine here controverted, is one of the most painful features of the case under consideration.

I commence with—

Bishop Ridley.

Few readers probably will require anything to be added to the decisive extracts given in a former part of this work[2] from

[1] Often called Poynet; and thus is he named in the Catena we are about to examine. But the name as affixed by the Author himself to his works, is *Ponet*.

[2] See p. 4 above.

Bishop Ridley; where we have seen him distinctly stating that the Body of Christ is "communicated and given, *not to the bread and wine,* but to them which worthily do receive the sacrament;" and that "this sacrament hath a promise of grace, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given by it as by an instrument; not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine."

But it may be well to add here a few more extracts.

Now his doctrine of Christ's presence in the Eucharist he distinctly states to be this, that "the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ is only remaining in heaven, and so shall be unto the latter day," but that "by grace" "the same "body of Christ is here present with us: even as, for example, "we say the same sun, *which in substance never removeth his place "out of the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light and "natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth.* For God's "word and his sacraments be, as it were, the beams of Christ, "which is *Sol justitiæ,* the sun of righteousness."[1]

No words could more clearly express Ridley's view of the nature of Christ's presence in the rite, or show more evidently its opposition to that of the Authors under review.

Again he says,—"It is very plain by the word of God, that Christ did give *bread* unto his disciples, and called *it* his body," and therefore he says, "Bread is the body of Christ,"[2] necessarily meaning, the sacramental body of Christ.

Nay more, he formally insists upon the *figurative sense* of the words, "This is my body," in his sixth argument at his "Disputation at Oxford," which runs thus:—

"The circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy and proportion of the sacraments, and the testimony of the faithful fathers ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the Holy Scripture touching the Sacrament.

"But the words of the Lord's Supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments and the sayings of the Fathers do *most effectually and plainly prove a figurative speech in the words of the Lord's Supper.*

"Ergo, *a figurative sense and meaning is specially to be received in these words, 'This is my body.'*"[3]

[1] Ridley's Remains, p. 13. [2] Ibid. p. 203. [3] Ibid. pp. 204, 205.

This passage alone would settle the whole question as to Ridley's views.

Many other similar extracts might be given, but no one seeking only to know the truth can require further evidence of his views, and therefore I shall merely add a reference to some other passages in a note below.[1]

But Ridley's special repudiation of the doctrine of the stricter Lutherans, that the substance of Christ's body is present together with the substance of the bread,—the very doctrine maintained by Archdeacon Denison,—must not be passed over. And he tells us in his "Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper," written in 1555, that "all learned men in England, so far as I know, both new and old, grant there to be but one substance" in the sacrament.[2] And again, in his "Conference with Secretary Bourn," he says,—

"As for Melancthon, quoth I, [i. e. Ridley,] whom Mr. Fecknam spake of, I marvel that ye will allege him; for we are more nigh an agreement here in England than the opinion of Melancthon to you: for in this point we all agree here, that there is in the sacrament but one material substance; and Melancthon, as I ween, saith there are two." "Ye say truth, quoth Mr. Secretary: Melancthon's opinion is so."[3]

Here, then, is a distinct rejection of the doctrine that besides the substance of the bread there is also present in the sacrament the substance of Christ's body, as held by the Lutherans and Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey. That he has used the phrase "material substance," makes no difference in the argument, because he alludes to it as Melancthon's doctrine; and this, as is well known, was, that the material substance was present in an immaterial form.

These passages, then, may serve to show, how far he is correctly quoted in the Catena as a maintainer of the doctrine of the Authors under review. And when we come to examine the way in which the quotations from his works are there made, we have still further evidence as to the character of the Catena. The first quotation made is—"Evil men do eat the very true and

[1] See pp. 15; 159, 160; 162; 201, 202; 217; 222; 224; 228; 230; 234; 236; 238; 248, 249; 251; and see also p. 196 as quoted p. 592 above.

[2] Ibid. p. 11. [3] Ibid. p. 160.

natural Body of Christ sacramentally and no further, as St. Augustine saith; but good men do eat the very true Body both sacramentally and spiritually by grace,"[1] which is adduced to prove that the Body of Christ is conjoined to the bread, and thus eaten by the wicked. Now the immediate context of this passage shows that Ridley, by the words eating the Body sacramentally, meant only eating *the sign* of the body; and he expressly adds, —"Evil men do eat the body of Christ sacramentally, but good men eat both the sacrament *and the matter of the sacrament;*"[2] showing that he held that the wicked do not eat "the matter of the sacrament."

Again, we find there the following extract:—

"*Curtop.* The sacrament of the blood is not the blood.

"*Ridley.* The sacrament of the blood is the blood; and that is attributed to the sacrament which is spoken of the thing of the sacrament.

"*Weston.* That is very well. Then we have blood in the chalice.

"*Ridley.* It is true; but by grace, and in a sacrament."[3]

Now will it be believed, that in the middle of this passage, which is printed in the Catena as if nothing had been omitted, a question and answer occur, in which Ridley uses these words:—

"*Ridley.* The blood of Christ is in the chalice indeed, but NOT IN THE REAL PRESENCE, *but by grace and in a sacrament.*"[4]

Once more; though the previous and subsequent context of the decisive passages quoted in p. 4 above, and just now again alluded to, as to the body of Christ not being communicated to the bread and wine but to the worthy receiver, &c. are given in the Catena,[5] those passages themselves are omitted, (the omission being, in this case, represented by stars) and no notice is taken of them.

I leave the judgment on all this to the reader, and pass on to

Archbishop Cranmer.

From the pen of Archbishop Cranmer we have an elaborate treatise on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, occupying a small

[1] Pt. i. p. 7. [2] Ridley's Remains, pp. 247, 248. [3] Pt. i. p. 12.
[4] Ridley's Remains, p. 238. [5] See pp. 13, 14.

folio volume, and largely treating of all the points now under discussion; particularly as to whether evil men do or do not eat the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper. From this treatise the compiler of the Catena gives *two* passages.

In the *latter* of these Cranmer merely declares his belief that his doctrine is agreeable to the word of God and that of the holy Catholic Church from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned Fathers and Martyrs of the Church. What benefit can arise to Archdeacon Denison's cause from this statement, in the case of any one who reads Cranmer's treatise, it is difficult to see.

The *former* passage is thus given in the Catena, and was thus quoted from Cranmer's works in defence of Archdeacon Denison on his trial:—

"'I say that the same visible and palpable flesh that was for us crucified, ... is eaten of Christian people at His holy Supper. . . . . The diversity is not in the Body, but in the eating thereof; no man eating it carnally, but the good eating it both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally.' . . . . . —*Remains*, iii. 310; iii. 44; iv. 16."

Thus precisely does it stand in the Catena, p. 19; and thus precisely was it quoted, with the references, on the trial. And the judges were solemnly assured at the trial, that all the extracts quoted from the Catena, from all the Authors referred to, had been carefully "*verified.*"

Now, in the first place, in the pages referred to nothing of the kind occurs. But the passage from which these words have been culled occurs in vol. iii. p. 340, and runs thus:—

"Now when you gather of the words of St. Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, (Serm. 11.) that both the evil and good eat one body of Christ, the selfsame in substance, excluding all difference that device of figure might imagine; *to this I answer*, that although you express the body of Christ with what terms you can devise, calling it, as you do in deed, the flesh that was born of the Virgin Mary, the same flesh, the flesh itself, yet I confess that it is eaten in the sacrament. And to express it yet more plainly than peradventure you would have me, I say, that the same visible and palpable flesh that was for us crucified, and appeared after his resurrection, and was seen, felt and groped, and ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth at his

Father's right hand, and at the last day shall come to judge the quick and the dead; that self-same body, having all the parts of a man's body, in good order and proportion, and being visible and tangible, I say is eaten of Christian people at his holy Supper. What will you now require more of me concerning the truth of the body? I suppose you be sorry that I grant you so much, and yet what doth this help you? For the diversity is not in the body, but in the eating thereof; no man eating it carnally, but the good eating it both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, THAT IS TO SAY, FIGURATIVELY. And therefore hath St. Augustine these words, 'certo quodam modo,' 'after a certain manner,' because that the evil eat the sacrament, which *after a certain manner is called the very body of Christ*, which manner St. Augustine himself declareth most truly and plainly in an epistle *Ad Bonifacium*, saying, 'If sacraments had not some similitude or likeness of those things whereof they be sacraments, they could in no wise be sacraments. And for their similitude and likeness, they have commonly the name of the things whereof they be sacraments. Therefore *after a certain manner the sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body, the sacrament of Christ's blood is Christ's blood.*'"[1]

So that when we come to read the passage as written by Cranmer, we find that its *express* object was to *oppose* the error in *support* of which it has been quoted; or rather, I should say, a mangled portion of it, deprived of the very parts which show its meaning, has been quoted. The sudden stop at the word "sacramentally," and the omission of the interpretative words that immediately follow, "*that is to say, figuratively,*" only admit of one explanation; and that I leave the reader to supply.

But even this exposure can give the reader but little idea of the nature of the attempts thus made to induce him to believe that Cranmer held such views as those of the Authors under review. It is almost impossible to open Cranmer's work on the Eucharist,[2] here referred to, in any part of it, without meeting with something directly *opposed* to the doctrine in *support* of

[1] CRANMER'S Remains, ed. Jenkyns, iii. 339, 340. Works, P. S. ed. i. 224, 225.

[2] This work, on its first appearance, was entitled "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament," and appeared in 1550. To this Bishop Gardiner replied, and in 1551 Cranmer published an "Answer" to Gardiner, in which the original work was reprinted, as well as Gardiner's reply to it. An edition of this latter work, containing Cranmer's last corrections before his martyrdom, was published in 1580.

which it is here quoted. Some passages from this work, and also from the account of his Disputations at Oxford and Examination before the Commissioners previous to his martyrdom, I have already given at the beginning of this work;[1] and from them we see, that Archbishop Cranmer laid it down as one of "the four principal points" in which he and the Romanists "*varied*," that "evil men do eat the very body and drink the very blood of Christ," Cranmer contending that "evil men do *not* eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood;" and he *professedly* devotes one book (the fourth) of his work to the defence of this position.

To quote the passages written for the express purpose of refuting such doctrine as that maintained by the Authors under review, it would be necessary to transcribe nearly the whole work. I shall content myself with a few additions to the extracts already given.

Some light may be thrown on Cranmer's views by his remark on the way in which he uses the word "sacrament." He says:—

"This word 'sacrament' I do sometimes use (as it is many times taken among writers and holy doctors) for the sacramental bread, water or wine; as when they say, that *sacramentum est sacræ rei signum*, 'a sacrament is the sign of a holy thing.' But when I use to speak sometimes (as the old authors do) that Christ is in the sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter; that is to say, not of Christ's carnal presence in the outward sacrament, but sometimes of his sacramental presence; and sometimes by this word 'sacrament,' I mean *the whole ministration and receiving of the sacraments*, either of baptism, or of the Lord's Supper; and so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the sacraments; not meaning by that manner of speech, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine (which be *only the outward visible sacraments*), but that in the due ministration of the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and his Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace *in all them that worthily receive the same*."[2]

[1] See pp. 5, 6, above.

[2] Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner, Pref. Works, P. S. ed. Pt. i. p. 3.

The following passages may serve as a specimen of hundreds that might be quoted :—

"They [the Romanists] say that Christ is corporally under or in the forms of bread and wine; we say, that Christ is *not there*, neither corporally *nor spiritually;* but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine he is spiritually, and corporally in heaven." [1]

"It is untrue that you say, that good men believe upon the credit of Christ, that there is truly in the sacrament the very true body of Christ. For Christ called bread his body, and wine his blood, (which, as the old authors say, *must needs be understanded figuratively ;*) but he never said that his true body is truly in the sacrament." [2]

"Our sacraments contain presently the very things signified, no more than theirs [i. e. those of the Old Testament fathers] did." [3]

"I mean not that Christ is spiritually either in the table, *or in the bread and wine* that be set upon the table, but I mean that he is present in the ministration and receiving of that holy Supper, according to his own institution and ordinance: like as in baptism Christ and the Holy Ghost be not in the water or font, but be given in the ministration, or to them that be truly baptized in the water. And although the *sacramental tokens be only significations and figures*, yet doth Almighty God effectually work, in them that duly receive his sacraments, those divine and celestial operations which he hath promised, and by the sacraments be signified." [4]

"Furthermore they do allege Tertullian, that he constantly affirmeth that in the sacrament of the altar we do eat the body and drink the blood of our Saviour Christ. To whom we grant, that our flesh eateth and drinketh the bread and wine, which *be called the body and blood of Christ*, because, as Tertullian saith, they do *represent* his body and blood, although they be not really the same in very deed. And we grant also, that our souls by faith do eat his very body and blood, but that is spiritually, sucking out of the same everlasting life. But we deny that unto this spiritual feeding is requiring, [required, ed. 1551] any real and corporal presence." [5]

"When bread is called the body of Christ, it taketh the name of a thing which it is not indeed, but is so called by a *figurative speech.*" [6]

"The bread after consecration is not called Christ's body, because

[1] Answ. to Gardiner, Bk. 3. Works P. S. ed. i. 54.
[2] Ibid. p. 73. [3] Ibid. p. 75. [4] Ibid. p. 148.
[5] Ibid. p. 153. [6] Ibid. p. 181.

it is so indeed, for then it were no figurative speech, *as all the old Authors say it is.*" [1]

"To utter the matter plainly without fallax or cavillation, I teach that *no man can eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood but spiritually;* which forasmuch as evil men do not, although they eat the sacramental bread until their bellies be full, and drink the wine until they be drunken, yet eat they neither Christ's flesh, nor drink his blood, neither in the sacrament, nor without the sacrament, because they cannot be eaten and drunken but by spirit and faith, whereof ungodly men be destitute, being nothing but world and flesh." [2]

"Although *neither good nor evil men eat Christ's body in the Sacrament under the visible signs*, in the which he is not but sacramentally; yet the good feed of him spiritually, being inhabiting spiritually within them, although corporally he be absent and in heaven; but the evil men neither feed upon him corporally nor spiritually, (from whom he is both the said ways absent) although corporally they eat and drink with their mouths the sacraments of his body and blood." [3]

"And for to set out this distinction somewhat more plainly, that plain men may understand it, it may thus be termed: that there is a spiritual eating only, when Christ by a true faith is eaten without the sacrament; also there is another eating both spiritual and sacramental, when the visible sacrament is eaten with the mouth, and Christ himself is eaten with a true faith; the third eating is sacramentally only, when the sacrament is eaten and *not Christ himself.* So that in the first is Christ eaten without the sacrament; in the second he is eaten with the sacrament; and in the third *the sacrament is eaten without him;* and therefore it is called sacramental eating only, because *only the sacrament is eaten, and not Christ himself.* After the two first manner of ways godly men do eat, who feed and live by Christ: the third manner of ways the wicked do eat; and therefore, as St. Augustine saith, 'they neither eat Christ's flesh, nor drink his blood, although every day they eat the sacrament thereof, to the condemnation of their presumption.'" [4]

"As all that be washed in the water be not washed with the Holy Spirit, so all that eat the sacramental bread, eat not the very body of Christ." [5]

"Although the work of God in his sacraments be effectual and true, yet the working of God in the sacraments is not his working

[1] Ibid. p. 182. [2] Ibid. p. 203. [3] Ibid. pp. 204, 205.
[4] Ibid. p. 205. [5] Ibid. p. 206; repeated in nearly the same words, p. 221.

by grace in the water, bread and wine, but in them that duly receive the same, which work is such as no carnal man can comprehend." [1]

"When you speak of the adoration of Christ in the sacrament, saying, 'that if he were not there present, substantially, really and corporally, St. Augustine would never have spoken of adoration there;' in this word, 'there,' you use a great doubleness and fallax, for it may be referred indifferently either to the adoration or to the presence. If it be referred to the presence, then it is neither true, nor St. Augustine saith no such thing, that Christ is really, substantially, and corporally present there. If it be referred to the worshipping, then it is true, according to St. Augustine's mind, that there in the receiving of the sacrament in spirit and truth, we glorify and honour Christ *sitting in heaven at his Father's right hand.* But to this adoration is required no real, substantial and corporal presence, as before I have declared. . . . And therefore to avoid all the ambiguity and fallax of your speech, I say, that we being here do worship here Christ, being not corporally here, but with his Father in heaven." [2]

"He [Christ] is not in it [the bread], neither spiritually, as he is in man, nor corporally, as he is in heaven, but only sacramentally, as a thing may be said to be *in the figure whereby it is signified.*" [3]

"St. Augustine saith not, that the thing signified is in the bread and wine, to whom [which] it is not exhibited, nor is not in it, but *as in a figure;* but that it is there in the true ministration of the sacrament, present to the spirit and faith of the true believing man, and exhibited truly and in deed, and yet spiritually not corporally." [4]

"In the bread and wine Christ is but figuratively, as I said before, and in the godly receivers spiritually, in whom also he tarrieth and remaineth, so long as they remain the members of his body." [5]

"They [the Fathers] taught that both the sacrament and the thing thereby represented, which is Christ's body, remain in their proper substance and nature, *the sign being here and the thing signified being in heaven.*" [6]

"To declare briefly and plainly the very truth according to the mind of Chrysostom, as we see with our eyes and eat with our mouths very bread, and see also and drink very wine, so we lift up our hearts unto heaven, and with our faith we see Christ crucified

[1] Ibid. p. 232. [2] Ibid. p. 235. [3] Ibid. p. 238. [4] Ibid. p. 281.
[5] Ibid. p. 282. [6] Ibid. p. 285.

with our spiritual eyes, and eat his flesh thrust through with a spear, and drink his blood springing out of his side with our spiritual mouths of our faith." [1]

"God's word is clearly against you, not only in your doctrine of transubstantiation, but *also in the doctrine of the real presence.*" [2]

"The true faithful man would answer, not as you have devised, but he would say, according to the old catholic faith and teaching of the apostles, evangelists, martyrs and confessors of Christ's Church, that in the sacrament or true ministration thereof be two parts, the earthly and the heavenly: the earthly is the bread and wine, the other is Christ himself: the earthly is without us, the heavenly is within us: the earthly is eaten with our mouths, and carnally feedeth our bodies; the heavenly is eaten with our inward man, and spiritually feedeth the same: the earthly feedeth us but for a time, the heavenly feedeth us for ever." [3]

"If it were an article of our faith, to believe that Christ is present *in the forms of bread and wine*, it were *an unprofitable article*, seeing that his being in the bread should profit no man." [4]

"That Council [the Nicene] would not have forbid us to direct our minds to the bread and cup, if they had believed that Christ had been really there." [5]

"I have most manifestly proved, as well by God's word as by ancient authors, that these words of Christ, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' be no plain speeches, but *figurative.*" [6]

And so again in his "Disputation at Oxford," he says that "the old doctors do call this speaking of Christ *tropical, figurative, anagogical, allegorical.*" [7]

"God worketh in his faithful, not in the Sacraments." [8]

One more passage shall close these extracts, and that is one from his Answer to Gardiner, in which he meets precisely the answer which Archdeacon Denison gives to passages in which it is stated that evil men eat not the body of Christ, namely, that they mean that evil men do not eat it fruitfully or with any good effect.

"Whereas I have fully proved, as well by authority of Scripture

[1] Ibid. p. 317. [2] Ibid. pp. 333, 334. [3] Ibid. p. 337. [4] Ibid. p. 338.
[5] Ibid. p. 356. [6] Ibid. p. 372. [7] Ibid. p. 398. [8] Ibid. p. 417.

as by the testimony of many old writers, that although evil men eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, which have the names of his flesh and blood, yet they eat not Christ's very flesh nor drink his blood; your short and whole answer is this, that evil men may be said not to eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, *because they do it not fruitfully, as they ought to do;* 'and that may be called a not eating, as they may be said not to hear God's word, that hear it not profitably; and a thing not well done, may be in speech called not done, in the respect of the good effect.' I grant such speeches be sometime used, but very rarely; and when the very truth cometh in discussion, then such paradoxes are not to be used. As if it come in question whether a house be builded, that is not well builded, then the definition of the matter must not be, that it is not builded, although the carpenters and other workmen have failed in their covenant and bargain, and not builded the house in such sort as they ought to have done. So our Saviour Christ teacheth that all heard the word, whether the seed fell in the highway, or upon the stones, or among the thorns, or in the good ground. Wherefore when this matter cometh in discussion among the old writers, whether evil men eat Christ's body or no, if the truth had been that evil men eat it, the old writers would not so precisely have defined the contrary, that they eat not, but would have said, they eat it, but not effectually, not fruitfully, not profitably. But now the authors which I have alleged, define plainly and absolutely, that evil men eat not Christ's body, without any other addition. But after this sort that you do use, it shall be an easy matter for every man to say what liketh him, and to defend it well enough, if he may add to the Scriptures and doctors' words at his pleasure, and make the sense after his own phantasy. The Scriptures and doctors which I allege do say in plain words, as I do say, 'that evil men do not eat the body of Christ, nor drink his blood, but only they that have life thereby.' Now come you in with your addition and gloss, made of your own head, putting thereto this word 'effectually.' If I should say that Christ was never conceived nor born, could not I avoid all the Scriptures that you can bring to the contrary, by adding this word 'apparently,' and defend my saying stoutly? And might not the Valentinians, Marcionists, and others, that said that Christ died not for us, defend their error with addition, as they did, of this word 'putative' to all the Scriptures that were brought against them? And what heresy can be reproved, if

the heretics may have that liberty that you do use, to add of their own heads to the words of Scripture?" [1]

I pass on to

Bishop Ponet.[2]

Dr. John Ponet, Bishop of Winchester, was one of the principal divines among our Reformers in the time of Edward VI., and author of the Catechism, published by Royal authority under the advice of Cranmer and Ridley, commonly called Edward the Sixth's Catechism. His testimony, therefore, is of considerable value on the subject of this work. And it becomes of more importance on account of his name being confidently quoted in the *Catena*,[3] and in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, in favor of the doctrine of a real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in or under the elements. In fact his testimony was one of the leading authorities cited in defence of Archdeacon Denison's doctrine.

The authority for this reference is a work published anonymously at Strasburg in 1557, entitled, "Diallacticon viri boni et literati de veritate, natura et substantia corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia," which has been attributed to him as the author.[4]

The testimony of Bishop Ponet is of so much importance that I think it is worth while to devote a little space to place beyond doubt what it is. I shall therefore proceed to show, *first*, that the testimony of the work referred to gives no support to that doctrine of the Real Presence which is advocated by the Authors under review, but only to the notion of a presence of virtue and influence in the bread and wine; *secondly*, that Bishop Ponet is *not* the author of the work; and *thirdly*, that the doctrine maintained by Bishop Ponet in his acknowledged works is entirely opposed to the doctrine of the Authors under review.

[1] Ibid. p. 215.

[2] The name is sometimes spelt *Poynet*, (as in the Tractarian *Catena*), and *Poinet*, but I give the name according to the author's own spelling in his works published with his name.

[3] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c., Pt. i. pp. 21—30.

[4] It was reprinted at Strasburg in 1576, small 8vo. It is also to be found reprinted at the end of the second volume of the Tractationes Theologicæ of Beza, printed Genev. 1573. fol. It was also reprinted Lond. 1688. 4to.

First, The doctrine advocated in the "Diallacticon" is not that of a real presence of the Body and Blood themselves in or under the elements, but only the presence of their virtue or influence; a doctrine expressly repudiated by Archdeacon Wilberforce as erroneous, and altogether different from that doctrine of the Real Presence which he maintains in his book, and which Archdeacon Denison advocates.

I might prove this by many passages, but the following will be sufficient; and I shall quote from that translation of the book, which (as we shall see hereafter) the author himself sanctioned with his approval.

"Now in this sacrament the Fathers of old time have noted two things for either of the which it may well be called and accounted the Body of Christ, but especially when it comprehendeth them both. For both because the bread is *a figure of the true body*, it is justly called his body, and much more because it hath *the lively force of the same joined thereto*, but, in especial, because it comprehendeth both."

He then goes on to show, that it may well be called the Body of Christ because it is *the figure of his body*, and then adds as follows:—

"We said there was another thing which the ancient Fathers acknowledging in this sacrament, would have it verily to be the Lord's Body, and that is the virtue of the Body itself that is of force, and giveth life, which virtue by grace and mystical blessing is joined with the bread and wine; and is called by sundry names, when the matter itself is all one. Of Augustine, an intelligible invisible and spiritual body: of Hierom, divine and spiritual flesh: of Irenæus, a heavenly thing: of Ambrose, a spiritual food, and body of a Divine Spirit: of other, some such like thing. And this also doth make much the more, that the sacrament is most worthy to have the name of the true body and blood, seeing not only outwardly it showeth forth a figure and image of it, but also inwardly it draweth with it a hid and secret natural property of the same body, that is to say, a virtue that giveth life: so that it cannot now be thought a vain figure, or the sign of a thing clean absent, but the very Body of the Lord, Divine indeed and spiritual, but present in grace, full of virtue, mighty in operation. And it happeneth often, that *the names of the things themselves be given to their virtue and strength*. We say leaven is in the whole lump, whereas a small quantity of leaven cannot spread so far abroad, but

the strength and sharpness of the leaven. We say that the fire doth warm us, when the *heat* of the fire doth it, we being *a good way off from the fire*. Likewise that the sun is present, doth lighten, burneth, nourisheth, when indeed the *heat* of the sun doth it, and *the sun himself cannot go out of his sphere*. So is a king said to be in all his realm, because of *the power of his dominion*." [1]

Now this passage at once shows how different is the doctrine of this treatise from that of Archdeacon Denison and the other Authors under review. The ABSENCE of the *Body itself* is here expressly maintained, and the only presence advocated is the presence of its virtue and strength in or conjoined to the elements. This, as I have already stated, is a notion advocated by a few English divines, and, though I agree with Archdeacon Wilberforce in rejecting it, in the sense of a union which makes the two one compound whole, is open to far less serious objection than that of Archdeacon Denison.

Secondly, Bishop Ponet was *not* the author of this work. That it has been ascribed to him is perfectly true, but the following evidence, taken as a whole, can leave no doubt that this was a mistake.

The testimony of Placcius, in his "Theatrum Anonymorum et Pseudonymorum," is this :—"Hujus libelli auctor fuisse creditur Ant. Cookus, Edw. VI. Angl. Reg. Præceptor et Consiliarius intimus." And he refers among other authorities to that of Scaliger, in his "Scaligeriana," ed. Lugd. Bat. 1668. 8vo. p. 81., where we find the words, "Cooki Præcept. Edw. VI. Diallacticon." He notices afterwards that Hyde, in his Bodleian Catalogue, under the title "Eucharistia," says, that some ascribe it to Cooke, others to Poinet.[2]

The words of Hyde are, "Author perhibetur Dñs Cooke, Præceptor Edw. VI., secundum alios est Dñs Poinet." [3]

Bishop Tanner, under the name Antonius Cookus, says,—"Ei attribuitur *Diallacticon*, &c., de veritate corporis Christi in Eucharistia. Argent. 1577. Vide Scaligeriana, p. 81. Placcium, i. 107;"[4] and again, under the name Johannes Ponetus,

[1] A Way of Reconciliation of a Good and Learned Man, &c., transl. by Lady Elizabeth Russell. Lond. 1605. 4to. pp. 67, 68, 70, 71.

[2] PLACCII Theatr. Anon. et Pseudon. Hamb. 1708. tom. i. p. 107.

[3] HYDE, Catal. Libr. Bibl. Bodl. 1674. fol. sub tit. *Eucharistia*.

[4] TANNER. Biblioth. Britanno-Hibern. 1748. p. 197.

speaking of this work, he says,—"An Poneto vel D. Ant. Cook (Scaligeriana apud Placcium, i. 107.) ascribendum dubium est."[1]

And before I proceed to further evidence, I would just point out that the very words in which the author is described in the title go far to prove that he was not of the clerical order, still less a Bishop. The words "*viri boni et literati*" could never have been used to describe a learned prelate of the Church, nor indeed is there any reason to be assigned why the name should not have been attached to it if Bishop Ponet had been the author, as it was attached to other works of his published at Strasburg just before, during his residence there. But these words are just those which would have been used to describe a layman such as Sir A. Cooke, who might naturally wish to publish such a work anonymously.

But these probabilities are turned into certainty by the following fact.

A daughter of Sir A. Cooke, married to Lord John Russell, translated this work into English, and had it printed (though not apparently published) with the following title:—

"A Way of Reconciliation of a Good and Learned Man, touching the Trueth, Nature, and Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament. Translated out of Latin into English by the Right Honourable Lady *Elizabeth Russell*, Dowager to the Right Honourable the Lord *John Russell*, Baron, and sonne and heire to *Francis* Earle of Bedford. At London. Printed by R. B. Anno 1605."

The work is a 4to. volume or tract containing four leaves occupied by the Title and prefatory matter, and fifty-two leaves occupied by the Treatise translated; which ends on page 104. A copy is in the Library of the Duke of Bedford at Woburn Abbey, which was formerly in the Bibliotheca Heberiana, being No. 6118 in Part 1. of the Sale Catalogue. And to His Grace's kindness I was indebted for a sight of this volume in drawing up this notice of it; and while these pages were passing through the press I was fortunate enough to obtain a copy.

To this translation Lady Elizabeth Russell has prefixed the following Dedicatory Epistle to her daughter Anne:—

"To the Right Honourable my most entierly beloved and onely

[1] Ibid. p. 604.

daughter, the Lady Anne Herbert, wife to the Lord Henry Herbert, sonne and heire apparant to Edward the most noble Earle of Worcester.

"Most vertuous and woorthilie beloved daughter, Even as from your first birth and cradle I ever was most careful, above any worldly thing, to have you sucke the perfect milke of sincere Religion: So willing to ende as I beganne, I have left to you, as my last Legacie, this Booke. A most precious Jewell to the comfort of your Soule, being the woorke of a most good, learned, and worthy man; Made above fiftie yeeres since in Germanie, After by traveile a French creature, Now naturalized by mee into English like to his learned Author, to whom from my part most Honour and service is due. Surely at the first I meant not to have set it abroad in Print, but my selfe onely to have some certaintie to leane unto, in a matter so full of controversie, and to yeeld a reason of my opinion. But since by my lending the Copie of mine owne hand to a friend, I am bereft thereof by some; And fearing lest after my death it should be Printed according to the humors of other, and wrong of the dead, who in his life approved my Translation with his owne allowance: Therefore dreading, I say, wrong to him above any other respect, I have by Anticipation prevented the worst. I meant this to you, good daughter, for a New-yeeres gift," &c. &c.

This "Dedicatory Epistle," connected with the evidence previously quoted, fixes the authorship of the book, or at any rate proves that Bishop Ponet was not the author. For Lady Elizabeth here states, that to the author "from my part most honour and service is due," and that she "dreads wrong to him above any other respect;" words which are totally inapplicable to Bishop Ponet, but altogether applicable to her own father. And again she says, the author "in his life approved my translation with his own allowance," which alone determines the question, for Bishop Ponet died at Strasburg April 11, 1556, *before the work was published,* and therefore certainly could not have given his approval to the translation of it; a translation which was evidently made some time after its publication, from the words, "made above fifty years since in Germany, after by traveile a French creature, *now naturalized by me into English.*"

I think it unnecessary to add another word to prove that Bishop Ponet is *not* the author. And I think the reader will agree with me that there can be no doubt that the author was

Sir Anthony Cooke, whose private views on this subject are certainly not a test of what is the doctrine of our Church.

The mistake probably arose partly from Bishop Ponet having resided at Strasburg on his expulsion from England on the accession of Queen Mary till his death, and more especially perhaps from the fact, that a work of a similar kind was published (as it is said, for I have not seen the work) by a *Peter Ponet*, the title of which I give below.[1] And it is observable that Sturmius, who attributes the work to Ponet, Bishop of Winchester, calls him "P. Ponet."[2]

Thirdly, The doctrine maintained by Bishop Ponet in his acknowledged works is entirely opposed to the doctrine of the Authors under review.

For, first, Bishop Ponet was author of the Catechism called Edward the Sixth's Catechism, from having been issued by Royal authority in 1553, as we learn from a letter of Sir John Cheke to Bullinger, written June 7, 1553, in which he says that the King "has lately recommended to the schools by his authority the Catechism of John Bishop of Winchester."[3]

Now what the testimony of this Catechism is, we have already seen.[4]

But still further, we have full information as to the real views of Bishop Ponet on the doctrine of the Eucharist, in a work of his expressly on the subject, and published by himself, with his name affixed to it. In 1550 he preached before Edward VI. and his Council a Sermon on the right use of the Lord's Supper from Matth. xiii. 4., "Some fell by the wayside,"—which he afterwards published under the title mentioned below.[5]

[1] Propugnaculum Christianæ Doctrinæ de vera et corporali præsentia Christi in Cœna. Antw. 1565. 12mo.

[2] Quære quæ scripsi in veteribus novis quatuor: et quæ præfatus sum ante annos viginti in Diallacticum P. Poneti Episcopi Wintoniensis. Jo. Sturmii Quarti Antipappi tres partes priores. Neapoli Palatin. 1580. 4to. Pt. iii. p. 176.

[3] Original Letters relative to the Reformation, published by the Parker Society, vol. i. p. 142. Heylin also attributes this Catechism to Ponet in his Historia Quinquarticularis, Pt. ii. c. 15. § i. and Certamen Epistolare, pp. 160, 161. See also Churton's Life of Nowell.

[4] See p. 733 above.

[5] "A notable Sermon, concerning the right use of the Lord's Supper . . . [stating that it was preached before the King and his Council, March 14, 1550] by Mayster John Ponet, Doctor of Divinity. . . . Printed at London, for Gwalter Lynne, 1550," 16mo. A copy is in the British Museum, from which I quote.

Speaking in this Sermon of what is meant by eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood and feeding upon Christ, after rebuking the Romish notions on the subject, he adds:—

"But it is meant that even as ye comfort your earthly and corruptible body with bread and meat when it is hungry, and with ale, beer, or wine when it is thirsty, even so doth the soul of man, when the law showeth to her her faults and eternal damnation, and the dreadful judgments of God for her offences, comfort herself in her great hunger and thirst, believing that Almighty God hath forgiven her sins for Christ's sake; so that whereas before she was hungry, and comfortless, and afraid of eternal damnation, now is she fed and comforted with the assurance that her sins be forgiven her of God for Christ's sake her Saviour." (Sheet c. fol. iii.)

Commenting on the words, "Nisi quis manducaverit," &c. (John vi.), and observing that a carnal eating was not Christ's meaning, he adds this explanation, what Christ's meaning was:—

"But that they which were made sorrowful and hungry by the terrors of the law, should be fed and comforted with the death of his flesh and with his blessed bloodshedding. And he that feedeth not his soul after this sort with Christ's flesh and blood is not alive in Christ, but he is in desperation. *Manet in morte* (Joh. iii. v. 11.) He dwelleth in death. Yea, being alive in this world, he hath a taste of hell, because his conscience is comfortless, and the worm biteth him continually, so that he hath the devil in his conscience. And he is altogether comfortless, because there is none other meat and comfort that can comfort our souls, but only the comfort that we have by Christ. And whosoever eateth this flesh and drinketh this blood with the mouth of belief, that this very flesh of Christ was put to death for him, and this very blood was once shed for him, he shall have everlasting life, and the Lord will raise him again at the latter day. And he hath a taste of the kingdom of God, even being alive. He hath peace and quietness in his conscience: which is *gaudium et pax in Spiritum Sanctum.* (Ro. xiv.) And this kind of eating is called of learned men an eating of Christ *spiritualiter*, (that is to say) a comforting with our souls with Christ spiritually. And as oft as we comfort our souls of this sort, we have a sure knowledge, and a feeling that the wrath of God the Father against us is pacified, and so be we of our former hunger eased.

"There is another kind of eating of Christ's body, and drinking of his blood, and that is called eating and drinking *sacramentaliter*,

sacramentally. And we eat Christ on this fashion as oft as we join the outward signs of bread and wine, (that is to say) the sacrament of the holy communion with our faith and inward belief, receiving a visible testimony of our inward belief in the face of the congregation. And if it chance any man to receive this outward pledge and testimony of the Lord's death, and have not this inward belief, the same man, in taking of that visible sacrament in the face of the congregation, maketh a lie to the Holy Ghost, because he showeth himself outwardly as though he comforted his soul inwardly with Christ, and yet indeed he doth not; and therefore when he taketh this heavenly sacrament, his conscience condemneth him, and telleth him that he is not inwardly so affected and disposed as his outward receiving of the sacrament doth pretend. Wherefore St. Paul giveth sentence of every such man, and saith (1 Cor. xi.) *Judicium sibi manducat et bibit*, He eateth and drinketh his own condemnation and judgment, which is an unworthy kind of eating. *Quia non dijudicat corpus Domini.* Because he hath no consideration why he eateth of that bread and drinketh of that cup, whereof he eateth and drinketh for an outward sacrament and testimony before the whole congregation, that he is inwardly fed and comforteth [comforted] by Christ's death, but inwardly indeed he feeleth no such comfort. Wherefore thus I may conclude, he that believeth, eateth ; and HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT, EATETH NOT, *although he eat the sacrament every day in the week.* And S. Austin being of the same mind saith, *Quid paras dentem et ventrem, crede et manducasti*, Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly, believe and thou hast eaten." (Sheet c. fol. vi, vii, viii.)

Proceeding afterwards to consider more particularly the nature of the sacrament, and replying to the erroneous views then entertained by many respecting it, he writes thus :—

"It is a sport to hear these ignorant blindlings what shifts they make when they be driven to their answer either concerning the sacrament itself, or else concerning the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. Some say that Christ is in this sacrament *realiter et substantialiter*, but not *naturaliter*, that is to say, really and substantially, but not naturally. And of this opinion be the most part of the school doctors. Some other hold that that opinion is false, and will in any wise have this word naturally. . . . Some say that the bread is transubstantiated, (that is to say) that the substance of the bread is gone, and the qualities only of the bread do remain, which opinion is an heresy in logic, to say that *accidens*

may be *sine subjecto*. Some say the bread is the body, and some say the body is under the bread. And if a man allege unto them the Article of our Creed, and say that that body which was born of the blessed Virgin Mary, and lived here on earth twenty-eight year, and suffered under Pontius Pilate, and that hung upon the cross, and that was dead and buried, that the self-same body arose again the third day from death, *no fantastical body*, but even the same flesh and bone and the self-same body that was felt of Thomas, and that it remaineth [remained] here forty-one days with his disciples after his resurrection from death, and that the self-same body is ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, (that is to say) in the glory of the Father, and that he shall not come again until the latter day, when he shall come to judge the quick and the dead, and to restore all things which were spoken of by the prophets accordingly as we read in the third of the Acts: they will say constantly that all this gear is plain false. For (say they) a priest may fetch Christ's manhood down from heaven when he will, before the latter day come, with saying, *Hoc est corpus meum*. Be he never so vicious a gentleman that saith the words, he hath Christ's body at his beck and commandment to bring him down when him lusteth.

"And for the maintenance of this their erroneous and anti-christian opinion they *will not stick to say, that Christ's body may be in sundry places at one time*, granting that it may be at Rome, at Paris, in London, in Canterbury, and in a thousand other diverse places at once.

"Whereas if ye read the Scriptures through, ye shall never find, that Christ's body was in two places at one time, or that after his resurrection it appeared in two sundry places at one time.

"This devilish opinion of theirs openeth a door to Marcion and the Manichees, who defied [*read here either* deified *or* defined] Christ's body after such a sort, that they denied it to be of like substance as other men's bodies be: against which doctrine St. Austin giveth this rule: *Cavendum est, ne ita divinitatem astruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus*. We must take heed (saith St. Austin) that we do not so affirm the divinity of his manhood, that we take away thereby of the truth of his body. And St. Austin doth plainly affirm that *this body must be in one place of heaven*, whereas it pleaseth his divine majesty to be. And he saith in the 30th Treatise upon John xvi., *Corpus enim in quo resurrexit in uno loco esse oportet*. The body wherein he did rise must be in one place. I am not ignorant that the printed copy of St. Austin hath in that place, *uno loco esse potest*, (that is) may be

in one place. But I pray you what is he that doubteth of that thing, that Christ's body may be in one place. Surely St. Austin would never have used so vain a sentence in so weighty a matter; and it is plain in the Decrees: *De consecratione, distinctione ii. ca. Prima quidem heresis:* and in the Master of the Sentence, in the fourth book, *distinctione decima*, that S. Austin is falsely printed in that point. For in both these places ye shall have these plain words: *Corpus enim in quo resurrexit in uno loco esse oportet.* The body of Christ, in which he arose, must be in one place. These two of their own school be sufficient witnesses to me, and to all men, that S. Austin was plainly of this opinion, that Christ's body must be at one time in one place, and cannot be at one time in sundry places. *In uno loco esse oportet.* It must be in one place.

"The best way to confute this sort of men, is to set the one of them against another; him that saith that Christ's body is there *naturaliter*, naturally, against them that say, it is the natural body of Christ, but not *naturaliter;* and them which say that there is a transubstantiation in the sacrament, against them that say that there is the body and the bread together; and them that say, the mouse may eat the sacrament, against them that say, the mouse cannot eat it; and them that say, it may mould, against them that say it cannot mould. And so shall we ease ourselves of a great deal of pains, in suffering the one of them to confute the other, who, as they have many heads, so have they many wits, and there is even as great a confusion amongst them as there was amongst the tongues in Babylon. Wherefore, when they strive to hit the matter, they lightly always miss, even as men that thresh heynes blindfold.

"But ye will say to me, Sir, ye have told us what some say, but what say you? Forsooth, Sir, I say as I have said, that Christ's blessed body is not eaten with our teeth so grossly and so carnally as they take it to be. But I believe that that very body which was born of the Virgin Mary, and was crucified, dead, and buried, and that very body which arose again the third day, and that was felt of Thomas after Christ's resurrection, that it had flesh and bones otherwise than spirits have, and that which did eat and drink with the disciples after his resurrection, and that which was seen of the disciples when it ascended into heaven, and that which sitteth at the right hand of God the Father according to the Article of our Creed, I believe (I say) that that body is in heaven only, and is not in the earth, accordingly as S. Augustine saith in the 50th Treatise upon John: *Conversatus est secundum corporis*

præsentiam, &c. That is to say, He was here conversant with the presence of his body forty days with his disciples, and they going with him and following him, he ascended into heaven in their sight, and he is not here, for he sitteth there on the right hand of his Father. By his divinity, his Godhead, his divine majesty, his power, and his providence, he is here and everywhere. But his manhood is a creature, and is in heaven only, and there shall he remain until the latter day. And yet is it true that Christ's very body is present at the ministration of the Lord's Supper: yea, even flesh, blood, and bone, as he was born of the Virgin Mary.

"Why, but what mean I to say so? This gear seemeth to be quite contrary to all that ever I have said before; his body is in heaven, and his body is present at the ministration of the sacrament of his Supper. These sayings seem to be directly repugnant the one of them to the other. To put you out of doubt on this point, ye shall understand that even *as the sun which is far off distant is absent from mine eye and yet is present to my sight, even so is Christ's body absent from my mouth and yet present to my belief.* For my belief ascendeth into heaven, even to that body of Christ which sitteth there at the right hand of God the Father, which is his very true and no fantastical body, flesh, blood, and bone as it was born of the Virgin Mary. And when I receive the holy communion, *Mea conversatio est in cœlis:* my conversation is in heaven: where Christ's body is even so present to my faith as the sun is present to my sight, and as the bread and wine be present to my mouth. *So that if I have no faith, Christ is* NOT PRESENT TO ME *when I receive the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.* If I have faith, Christ's body being in heaven in one only place, is present to my faith; and when I receive the holy communion I embrace him by faith, even flesh, blood and bone as he was born of the Virgin Mary. And so do all men throughout the whole world hang upon him, and comfort themselves with that only body, *being in one place of heaven*, though they be dispersed into never so many sundry places throughout the world." [1]

Such is Bishop Ponet's testimony.

As these three authors, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, and Bishop Ponet, are the only authorities of this period cited in support of the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison, and as we have found their real testimony to be clearly and decidedly *adverse* to it, it seems unnecessary to detain the reader with extracts from other divines of the same period; especially as those three are beyond comparison the leading authorities for the reign

[1] Sheet D. iv. to E. iii.

of Edward VI.; otherwise it would have been easy to have confirmed their testimony by that of other eminent divines of the same age.

SECTION III.

Extracts from the divines who flourished during the first fifty years after the establishment of the Reformation on the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

It is a remarkable fact, that no one holding the office of Bishop, Dean, Archdeacon, or Divinity Professor during a period of nearly forty years succeeding the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558—unquestionably the most important for testing the meaning of our Formularies by the writings of our divines, as being the period in which the compilers of those Formularies lived—is quoted in the Catena or was referred to in the defence of Archdeacon Denison; with the single *partial* exception of Bishop Jewel, who was only cited (and most erroneously cited) on the meaning of the word "sacrament." Hooker certainly was Master of the Temple during this period, and therefore held an office somewhat above that of the ordinary clergy, and indeed needs no such recommendation. But he is the only one of those referred to who during the period above mentioned held any such office. Bishop Overall comes first, who succeeded Dr. Whitaker as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1596; and in the next few years we find, of those referred to in the *Catena*, Bishops Andrewes, Morton, and Lake, and Dean Field.

I shall now, therefore, proceed to examine the testimony of these witnesses, who (with the exception of Saravia) are *all* of those cited in the *Catena* who can be said to have flourished during the first fifty years after the establishment of the Reformation on the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

The case of Saravia, whose work cited in this matter never saw the light till the Archdeacon published it in defence of his cause, I have already sufficiently noticed.[1] This work of Saravia, indeed, is of itself, indirectly, a witness that the Archdeacon's doctrine is not that of the Reformed Church of England. For

[1] See pp. 228—230 above.

while the Archdeacon maintains, that the doctrine of this work is "the precise teaching" which he has inculcated, the author, Saravia, (as I have already pointed out[1]) tells the King in his "Dedication," that he "resumes the matter at that point at which it stood in 1536;" thus putting aside all the Formularies which had been established in our Church subsequent to that period.

Besides the Authors cited in the *Catena*, I find Bishop Bilson also referred to by a former writer of the same school as an advocate of their doctrine of the Real Presence. I shall therefore add his name to the list of witnesses to be examined. And beyond these writers I think it unnecessary to carry the investigation for this period.

No one at all acquainted with our theological Elizabethan literature can be unconscious, that I might bring a host of witnesses for this period; but to carry out such an examination of the writings of our divines would swell the dimensions of this work beyond, I fear, the patience of most readers. If, however, the Archdeacon is inclined to claim any other supporter among the divines of this period, let him do so, and I will examine the grounds of his claim.

I begin with

Bishop Bilson,

Bishop of Worcester, 1596;—Winchester, 1597 to 1616.

One of the most eminent and learned prelates of Elizabeth's reign was Bishop Thomas Bilson, who, among various other learned works, published, in 1585, when he was Warden of Winchester, one entitled, — "The true difference between Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion;" (Oxford, 1585, 4to.; reprinted, Lond. 1586, 8vo.) to which was prefixed a dedicatory Epistle to the Queen.

From this work (one sentence of which has been frequently quoted by the Tractarians to prove that Bishop Bilson maintained their view of the Presence) I extract the following complete refutation of their whole doctrine on the subject.

The wicked cannot eat the flesh of Christ, nor drink his blood:—

"The words of Christ be plain. 'Your fathers did eat manna in

[1] See p. 229 above.

the wilderness, and are dead. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.' 'Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.' (John vi. 51, 54.) But the wicked, notwithstanding the corporal chamming of this sacrament, die the death of sinners; ergo, *they neither eat the flesh of Christ, nor drink his blood;* not because their teeth or jaws fail them, but by reason they want faith, which is *the right and proper instrument of spiritual eating.* Since, then, man 'believeth with his heart unto righteousness' (Rom. x.), as Paul teacheth, not with his jaws nor lips; ergo, *the soul of man which only believeth, only doth eat the flesh of Christ;* and our bodies, which have no means to believe, can neither eat nor drink in that sort and sense that our Saviour there speaketh of."[1]

"*The wicked live not by Christ, neither abide in Christ, and therefore by the very determination of the Lord himself, they neither eat his flesh, nor drink his blood.* Run now to your distinction of corporal and spiritual eating when you will, but so long as these words stand written in the Gospel, 'he that eateth me, even he shall live by me,' the godly will soon conclude, THAT SUCH AS LIVE NOT BY CHRIST, DO NOT EAT CHRIST: [his own capitals:] and so that corporal eating of Christ's flesh, which you would erect, common to the faithful and faithless, to be no kind of eating at all, notwithstanding they receive the material and external elements of this mystery."

He then proceeds to show that the Fathers maintain the same doctrine, quoting first Augustine, as "proving that neither heretics nor wicked Christians do in deed eat the body of Christ, but only the sacrament, that is, the sacred sign of his body." And, replying to his adversary's objection that Augustine admits that the wicked eat sacramentally the body of Christ, though not spiritually, he says,—"Sacramental eating is the carnal and visible pressing with teeth the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; it is *not the real eating of Christ himself.*" His adversary objects just as Archdeacon Denison does, "The Sacrament is Christ, we say:" to which he replies,—"But so said not "St. Augustine. He diligently distinguisheth, *sacramentum et* "*rem sacramenti:* the sacrament and the thing (which is the "other part) of the sacrament, interpreting the sacrament to be "*sacrum signum:* a sacred sign: and the thing itself to be the

[1] pp. 745, 746, ed. 1585; p. 585, ed. 1586.

" body of Christ. . . . Of the sacrament, he saith, 'It is received " at the Lord's Table of some to life, of some to destruction.' " *Res vero ipsa*, &c. 'But the thing itself whereof that is a " sacrament (is received) of all men to life, and of none to death, " whosoever is partaker of it.'" And having quoted other Fathers speaking to the same effect, he adds,—"The sacra- " ments, that is, the sacred signs of Christ's body and blood, " the wicked do eat: *Christ himself they do not.* And why? " The sacraments are carnally pressed with teeth, which they " are partakers of as well as the godly; but *Christ himself is* " *not eaten with teeth;* and therefore *the wicked, wanting both* " *spirit and faith by which he is received, cannot possibly eat his* " *flesh, or drink his blood, though they come to his table never so* " *often.*" [1]

The flesh of Christ not to be eaten orally :—

"This is their [the Fathers'] doctrine touching the visible part of this sacrament, which is seen with eyes, felt with hands, and bruised with teeth: of that there is no doubt but it entereth our mouths and resteth in our bowels: and that, for the causes which I before rehearsed, after consecration is everywhere called by them the Lord's body: but that the natural flesh of Christ, *which is the other and inward part of the sacrament*, entereth the mouth, or abideth the teeth, or passeth down the throat, or lodgeth in the stomach, this is a position *wholly repugnant both to Fathers and Scriptures*. . . . . Christ's words were spoken not of our mouths, which believe not, but of our spirits, which have no flesh nor bones, and consequently neither teeth to grind, nor jaws to swallow, but only faith and understanding." [2]

" The signs which are called after consecration by the names of Christ's body and blood, do enter our mouths, and pass our throats; the true flesh and blood of Christ do not, but are eaten at the Lord's table only of the inward man by faithful devotion and affection, preparing the heart that Christ may lodge there, and dwell there, where he delighteth, and not in the mouths and jaws of men, which is no place for him, THAT SITTETH IN HEAVEN, WHITHER WE MUST FLY WITH THE SPIRITUAL WINGS OF OUR SOULS AND SPIRITS BEFORE WE CAN BE PARTAKERS OF HIM." [3]

[1] pp. 777, 778; and see p. 783, ed. 1585. pp. 627—629; and see pp. 635, 636. ed. 1586.

[2] p. 759. ed. 1585. pp. 603, 604, ed. 1586.

[3] p. 762. ed. 1585. pp. 607, 608, ed. 1586.

When the Fathers speak of the oral eating of Christ's body, they are referring to the signs as called by the name of the things signified:—

"The selfsame Fathers avouch that the flesh of Christ entereth not the body, is not bitten with teeth. . . . . This apparent negative notwithstanding, when they sometimes, treating of other matters, happen to say, 'Our mouth receiveth the body of Christ,' 'the substance of our flesh is increased and consisteth of his body and blood,' you would have us interpret these sayings of the very same things which they denied to pass that way, and not of *the signs, which in the perpetual use of speech amongst all divines after consecration were called by those names and none other;* and leaving their own direction which they give us, to charge them with *a flat contradiction, and heinous assertion* as themselves agnize, *if the letter be urged,* and the speech not mollified with a spiritual and mystical exposition."[1]

The eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood not of an oral, but only of a spiritual kind·—

To the objection of his opponent, "Our bodies eat it, [*i. e.* the flesh of Christ,] that our souls may be nourished by it," he replies,—"Eating, digesting, and nourishing be consequent "and coherent actions: and therefore they must all three be "either corporal or spiritual. If the soul be nourished, the "soul must eat and digest that which is eaten. If the body eat, "the body must digest and be nourished by that food."[2]

"PHILAND.[3] The Fathers affirm that his body is eaten with our mouths. THEOPHIL. And so they affirm, that his body and blood do increase and augment the substance of our mortal and sinful bodies. PHILAND. But that cannot be. THEOPHIL. No more can the other. PHILAND. How shall our bodies rise at the last day, if Christ's body be not in them? THEOPHIL. Our resurrection dependeth not on the act of eating his flesh, but of nourishing our flesh with his, as Irenæus telleth us: and the things which we eat, are not the causes, but, as the great Nicene Council admonisheth, the pledges of our resurrection. Their words be ταῦτα εἶναι τὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀναστάσεως σύμβολα. We must believe 'these to be the signs or pledges of our resurrection.' PHILAND. St. Chrysostom

[1] pp. 769, 770, ed. 1585; pp. 617, 618, ed. 1586.

[2] p. 770, ed. 1585; p. 618, ed. 1586.

[3] Philander is the supposed Roman Catholic opponent, the treatise being written in the form of a dialogue.

earnestly enforceth the eating of Christ's flesh; and saith we do not only eat it, but even 'fasten our teeth in his flesh.' THEOPHIL. In deed he saith so, but if you did not avert both your eyes and ears from the truth, you would perceive by that very sentence both the manner of his and other Fathers' speeches of that sacrament, and the right intent of their doctrine in those cases. His words are,—'Christ suffering himself not only to be seen of those that are desirous, but to be touched and eaten, and our teeth to be fastened in his flesh, and all to be satisfied of their longing after him.' PHILAND. Methinketh these words be very plain words. He suffereth our teeth to be fastened in his flesh. THEOPHIL. Very plain they be, but very false also, unless you either take the flesh of Christ for *the sign called by that name:* or else *refer teeth and biting to the soul and faith of the inward man,* as well as you do the eyes and hands wherewith we see him and touch him. . . . PHILAND. Doth not this Father say, we fasten our teeth in his flesh? THEOPHIL. Doth he not also say, we see him with our eyes and touch him with our hands? PHILAND. That is referred to our faith; as S. Ambrose teacheth. *Fide Christus videtur, fide Christus tangitur* (In 9. Lucæ, li. 6. § et ecce vir &c.), 'By faith Christ is seen, by faith Christ is touched.' THEOPHIL. And why shall not the next (which is more unlikely to be true) be referred to faith as well as the former?" [1]

"PHIL. The spiritual eating we do not deny, but we add to that a corporal, because the soul may be partaker of Christ by faith, notwithstanding the mouth receive the very flesh of Christ *under the forms of bread and wine.* THEOPH. This is your only refuge that is left: and this will not help you. For examine this answer awhile, and you shall soon see the weakness of it. 'My flesh is truly meat,' saith Christ, 'and my blood is truly drink.' He that doubteth of this, we hold him accursed, you do the like: thus far we agree. Mary, for what part of man, soul or body, this meat was provided, in this we dissent. You say, for the body no less than for the soul; we say, for the soul, and not for the body. . . . . Next you confess that the mortal and sinful bodies of men may not be substantially nourished with the glorious and immortal flesh of Christ; and eating is altogether in vain (even of the flesh of Christ itself) without nourishing, and all the Fathers with one consent teach this to be the end of eating the flesh of Christ, that we should be thereby nourished to life eternal. Why then strive you for a corporal eating where yourselves dare not defend any corporal nou-

[1] pp. 771, 772, ed. 1585; pp. 619, 620, ed. 1586.

rishing? Why distract you eating from nourishing, by referring them, one to the body, and the other to the soul, which the Fathers always joined and applied to one and the selfsame part of man? .... So that that part of man doth not eat the flesh of Christ, which is not nourished with it. And since you dare not avouch that our bodies are really nourished with the flesh of Christ, why should you hold that our mouths do really eat him? Lastly, with what one meat can you fit both the bodies and souls of men? *That which entereth the body must be local and corporal.* That which feedeth the soul must be spiritual and intellectual. The soul hath no local receipts, nor corporal instruments for her kind of eating, but only faith and understanding. So that if the flesh of Christ in this mystery be material and local, how can it feed the soul? If it be spiritual and intellectual, how can it be chammed with teeth, or closed in the straits of the stomach? Local not local, corporal not corporal, be plain contradictions, and by no means incident to the natural flesh of Christ. One it must needs be, both it cannot be, though you would sweat out your hearts with wrangling. And that Christ is not eaten with teeth or mouth," &c. (as above.) [1]

The words, "This is my body," to be interpreted figuratively:—

"PHIL. Did not Christ say, 'This is my body'? THEOPH. You must prove the speech to be *literal*, as well as the words to be his. PHIL. Is not the letter plain, 'This is my body'? THEOPH. The letter is so plain, that it killeth the carnal interpreter; and hath driven you, whiles you would needs refuse *the figurative and spiritual constructions* of Christ's words, to these absurdities and enormities, which have even overwhelmed your Church. PHIL. Can you wish for plainer words than these, 'This is my body'? THEOPH. I could wish that in expounding these words you did rely rather on the Catholic Fathers, than on your uncatholic fancies. PHIL. All the Fathers with one voice join with us in this doctrine. THEOPH. You do but dream of a dry summer. Not one of the antient Fathers ever spake of your real presence, *or the literal sense of these words*, on which you build the rest." [2]

"THEO. The literal acception of these words as they lie, 'This (bread)[3] is my body,' is first impossible, by your own confession, next blasphemous by the plain level of our Creed, and lastly barbarous by the very touch and instinct of man's nature. PHI.

[1] pp. 776, 777, ed. 1585; pp. 626, 627, ed. 1586.

[2] p. 726, ed. 1585; p. 558, ed. 1586.

[3] In the previous context, he has shown that the word 'This' must mean *bread*, and therefore he here adds the word *bread*, as understood in the passage.

Charge you Christ with so many foul oversights in speaking the words? THEO. The words which Christ spake be gracious and religious, we know; but where there may be brought a double construction of them, a carnal or a spiritual, a literal or a sacramental, *the literal construction which you will needs defend to deface the other, is, we say, reproved, as no part of our Saviour's meaning*, by those three bars which we proposed..... Why press you the letter, which is heinous, and forget that the speech cannot be religious except it be figurative?"

And after much more to the same effect, he adds with reference to the Fathers,—

"Show but one antient Father that ever affirmed the words of Christ at his last Supper were *properly spoken, or literally to be taken*, and we will receive your sense." [1]

"[The Fathers] do not only witness that the bread is a sign of Christ's body, but also *that Christ's words were figurative*, and that in delivering the mysteries he called the bread his body, by way of signification, similitude, representation, after the manner of sacraments, in a sign, not according to the letter, but in a spiritual and mystical understanding, and, if you respect the precise speech, improperly and figuratively." [2]

The same thing is repeated in pp. 742, 743, ed. 1585; and pp. 580, 581, ed. 1586.

"I trust the godly will be fully resolved, that the manner of eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, which the Lord himself first proposed in the sixth of John, was *not literal nor corporal*, as the Capernites understand him and were deceived, but *allegorical and spiritual. Allegorical* in respect of the words which be not there precisely taken in their usual signification for grinding with the teeth, and straining down the throat, but *figuratively spoken*, and import as much as *confessing and embracing with heart and inward affection. Spiritual*, because not our mouths, but our minds, not our bellies, but our spirits, are nourished with the flesh and blood of Christ, and that not by chewing or swallowing, but BY REMEMBERING AND BELIEVING THAT HIS BODY WAS WOUNDED, AND HIS BLOOD SHED FOR OUR PERFECT AND ETERNAL REDEMPTION. Now the Lord's Supper is correspondent, not contrary to the sixth of John, as we saw before by the verdict of the Fathers, and confession of yourselves. Therefore the Lord's Table teacheth

[1] pp. 733—735, ed. 1585; pp. 568—571, ed. 1586.
[2] p. 739, ed. 1585; p. 576, ed. 1586.

no literal nor carnal, but a spiritual and mystical, eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking of his blood; which you cannot observe so long as you press the letter of these words: 'Take, eat, this is my body.' For taking and eating in the Supper be corporal actions, even as breaking the bread and delivering the cup are. Then if the words, 'This is my body,' be literal, the consequent is inevitable, that the flesh of Christ is really taken with hands, actually bruised with teeth, corporally lodged in the belly. But this error the Lord in his own person confuted, and the Catholic Fathers refell, as impious, irreligious, and heinous; *ergo*, the words of the Supper, 'This is my body,' be not literal, but rather answerable to the doctrine proposed in the sixth of John, which is nothing less than literal." [1]

Against the pretence of eating the flesh of Christ, not carnally, but still orally, by a sacramental manducation of it; and that oral eating is the Capernaite error:—

"PHI. You make but a double manner of eating Christ's flesh, where you should make a triple. A carnal, spiritual, and sacramental.[2] A carnal, which the Capernites dreamt of, when they supposed they should have eaten raw flesh to sight and taste as they did other meats. A spiritual, by faith and understanding; in which sort, every good man may eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood at any time without the mysteries. *A sacramental, as when we eat the flesh of Christ under the forms of bread and wine;* though we neither see nor taste flesh or blood. Of these three sorts, the sixth of St. John's Gospel refelleth only the carnal, which the Capernites grossly fell to, when they heard our Saviour speak of the Sacrament. THEO. I blame you not, if you be loth to be counted Capernites. They were reproved by our Saviour as gross mistakers of his speech .... but would God you were as willing to leave their error as you be to refuse their name..... That eating which he there taught [*i.e.* in John vi.], was *by faith and understanding;* and they that murmured at him, and departed from him, thought he had meant eating with the mouth and teeth. What lack you, then, of the Capernites' error, when you affirm that the natural and substantial body of Christ is really eaten with teeth? .... PHI. ... We eat Christ in a mystery by faith: and though we taste and see nothing but bread and wine,

[1] p. 746, ed. 1585; pp. 585, 586, ed. 1586.

[2] On this Bishop Bilson makes the marginal annotation,—"This is a poor shift; for *sacramental eating is no more but eating the sacred sign of that heavenly food.*"

yet do we prefer the truth of his promise before the judgment of our senses, which you do not. And therefore you falsely slander us, when you charge us with the carnal opinion of the Capernites. THEO. I can yield you no freer choice, than if you like not their company, to leave their error."[1]

"Eating, as I have showed you, doth consist not in seeing or tasting, but in chamming and swallowing; and since you therein consent with the Capernites, though you could allege twenty diversities between their manner of eating and yours, yet both are corporal, and contrary to that doctrine which Christ delivered in the sixth of John. For that, as I have proved, was intended and referred to the souls and spirits of men, not to their throats or entrails; and therefore well, in covering the body of Christ, and deluding your senses, you may differ from the Capernites; but in preparing your teeth and jaws for the flesh of Christ, and in drawing his words from their MYSTICAL AND FIGURATIVE SENSE, you *join with the Capernites* against all the Catholic Fathers that ever wrote in the Church of Christ."[2]

His explanation of John vi. :—

"I do not say, Christ speaketh in the sixth of John of the material elements of bread and wine, which were then first ordained to be pledges of his invisible graces, when the Supper was first instituted, and therefore *not spoken of before that time:* but this is it which I affirm, and in this the learned and antient Fathers agree with me, that where this mystery consisteth of two parts, an earthly matter, and a heavenly virtue, *the sixth of St. John treateth not of the signs, but of the things themselves;* not of *the figures representing, but of the truth represented;* not of that which is corporally proposed, but of that which is ghostly received in the Lord's Supper, which is the better and diviner part of this Sacrament; and that the disciples there learned in what sort themselves, and all the faithful after them, should eat the Lord's flesh, and drink the Lord's blood at his Table, to be thereby quickened, nourished, and incorporated with him, as members of his mystical body. So that if any doubt arise, not touching the creatures of bread and wine, but touching the flesh and blood of Christ, which are the principal parts of this mystery, the solution and explication of every such doubt must be fetched from the place where the Lord first revealed this secret, rebuked the Capernites for the misconstruction of his words, and taught his disciples how they should be both

[1] pp. 746, 747, ed. 1585; pp. 586, 587, ed. 1586.
[2] p. 749, ed. 1585; p. 590, ed. 1586.

fruitful partakers of his flesh, and rightful interpreters of his speech."[1]

"Christ's exposition in the sixth of John was purposely made to confute the carnal Jews, who, when they heard of eating man's flesh and drinking blood, dreamt of no kind of eating and drinking but with their bodily jaws and lips, and for that cause murmured, as if they had been invited to some barbarous and brutish act: and next, to teach the disciples that endured his words, in what sort they should look for a diviner and purer kind of eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, *by believing, hoping, and rejoicing in his flesh that was wounded and blood that was shed for their sins.* This he assured and ratified unto them by ordaining afterward a Sacrament, which they should visibly see, but invisibly understand, and corporally receive, but spiritually interpret; in believing the same, by the power of his word and Spirit, to have in it, and carry with it, the fulness of his truth and mercy, openly sealed with those pledges of his promises and instruments of his grace, lest their faith should faint by reason of his departure and absence from them, or their hearts fail them, as if they were destitute of his protection and favor, amidst so many troubles as should enclose them."[2]

"By the constant confession of all the Fathers, the Lord *throughout this chapter* did not refer eating and drinking to the bodies of his disciples, but unto their souls; and meant their faith, and not their teeth."[3]

No Real Presence in or under, or under the forms of, the Bread and Wine:—

"PHI. By this place, [of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite,] you see, Christ is *covered with the forms of bread and wine,* as with garments, and that is *word for word our opinion.* THEO. Add *συμβολικῶς, figuratively,* as your author doth, and then both YOUR REAL PRESENCE IS OVERTHROWN, and the doctrine which we teach clearly established. For we confess that Christ worketh in us, and presenteth himself unto us in these mysteries, as it were in certain veils and coverings; which *mystically by way of signification and spiritual operation,* contain and clothe his grace and truth; but NOT REALLY, nor by material or corporal inclusion, as you affirm. . . . . Christ is signified and received by these signs and

[1] pp. 740, 741, ed. 1585; p. 578, ed. 1586.
[2] p. 742, ed. 1585; pp. 580, 581, ed. 1586.
[3] p. 744, ed. 1585; p. 583, ed. 1586.

figures . . but that Christ is locally or *substantially closed within the forms of bread and wine* . . . Dionysius hath no such sense nor words."[1]

Christ not in the elements, but only in the soul of man :—

" Men are the members of Christ, bread is not; Christ abideth in them and they in him, *in the bread he doth not;* . . . . We are knit unto him even by the truth of his and our nature, flesh, and substance, as members of the same body to their head, the sacrament is not, but ONLY ANNEXED AS A SIGN to the heavenly grace and virtue of Christ mightily present, and truly *entering the soul* of every man that is fitly prepared with faith and repentance to receive and lodge so worthy a guest."[2]

Christ's flesh and blood eaten and drunk more truly in his word than in the bread and wine :—

" The Sacraments take their force only and wholly from the word, neither is the word any whit the stronger or better for the visible signs, but our weakness is stayed and supported by them, and they endued with power and virtue by the word to sanctify the receiver, *where it is believed.* And therefore Christ cometh and dwelleth in us as truly by his word as by his sacraments; and if you compare them, *more truly by his word, than by the signs and seals of his word.* . . . . WE EAT HIS FLESH AND DRINK HIS BLOOD MORE TRULY IN THE WORD, THAN IN THE SACRAMENTAL AND MYSTICAL SIGNS."[3]

The nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist :—

" We confess him to be there [*i. e.* at the altar] present with all his gifts and blessings to him that will behold him with the eye of faith, and reach out the hand of his soul to apprehend him, in greater might and majesty than you do when you *shroud him with your forms of bread and wine*, and pale him round with a pix as it were with a sepulchre. . . . . His truth is annexed to the sacraments, and his power united to the creatures after a wonderful and unspeakable manner, by the mighty working of the Holy Ghost; but yet we must not direct his divine honour and service to any part of the altar, or circumference of the visible creatures: we must rather 'lift up our hearts,' as the faithful were always admonished in this sacrament, and take heed that we do not basely bend our

[1] p. 716, 717, ed. 1585; p. 546, ed. 1586.
[2] pp. 719, 720, ed. 1585; pp. 549, 550, ed. 1586.
[3] p. 720, ed. 1585; pp. 550, 551, ed. 1586.

eyes on *the bread or wine to seek Christ in them and underneath them*, much less worship them instead of him." [1]

"Neither is his divine power only present with us, but also we have his human nature many ways with us in this world. 'Thou hast Christ,' saith Austin, 'in this world, and in the next. In this world by faith, in this world by the sign of Christ, in this world by the sacrament of Baptism, in this world by the meat and drink of the altar.' (In Joh. tract. 50.) By these things we have him in this world, NOT REALLY, locally, or corporally, but truly, comfortably, and effectually, so as our bodies, souls, and spirits be sanctified and preserved by him against the day of redemption, when we shall see him and enjoy him face to face in that fulness and perfection which we now are assured of by faith, and prepared for by cleanness and meekness of the inward man. The whole Church therefore . . . taught all men to 'lift up their hearts' *from the elements, which were before their eyes, to him that is in heaven*, and shall come from thence, and from no place else, to judge the world. . . . . For this cause, the great Council of Nice directed the whole Church to lift up their understanding above the bread and wine which they saw, and by faith to conceive the Lamb of God slain for the sins of men, and proposed and exhibited on the Lord's Table in those mysteries . . . which admonition the Church ever after observed, by crying upon the people 'to lift up their hearts,' *not to the sacraments which they saw, but from them to him that lived and reigned in heaven*." [2]

"Against them which defend, that this Sacrament doth only figure, not offer; signify, not exhibit grace; the letter may well be forced to prove the Divine power and operation of the mystical elements. Against us which hold the visible signs, in substance, to be creatures, in signification, mysteries, in *operation and virtue*, the things themselves, whose names they bear, this illation concludeth nothing . . . together with the name go the virtues and effects of Christ's flesh and blood, united in manner of a sacrament to the visible signs." [3]

"Since the substance of the creatures is not changed, the signs could not justly bear the names of the things themselves, except the *virtue*, *power*, and *effect* of Christ's flesh and blood were adjoined to them and united with them, after a secret and unspeakable manner, by the working of the Holy Ghost, *in such sort that*

[1] pp. 711, 712, ed. 1585; p. 539, ed. 1586.
[2] pp. 722, 723, ed. 1585; pp. 553—555, ed. 1586.
[3] p. 751, ed. 1585; pp. 592, 593, ed. 1586.

whosoever DULY *receiveth the sign, is undoubtedly partaker of the grace;* offered unto all, but enjoyed only by those that with faith and repentance cleanse the inward man from that corruption of flesh and spirit which Christ abhorreth." [1]

"As we doubt not that Christ is always present on his table in *truth, grace, virtue, and effect, if we open the eyes of our faith to behold him, and mouth of our spirits to receive him,* so the local[2] and corporal hiding of his human substance under the shews of bread and wine was never taught by any Catholic Father or Council." [3]

Hence we may see the meaning of the presence asserted in the following words,—often quoted, in opposition to the whole tenor of his treatise, to prove him to be a supporter of the doctrine of a real bodily presence :—

"God forbid we should deny, that the flesh and blood of Christ are truly present and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's table. It is the doctrine that we teach others and comfort ourselves with. We never doubted but 'the truth was present with the sign and the spirit with the sacrament,' as Cyprian saith. (De unct. Chrism.) 'We knew there could not follow an operation, if there went not a presence before.' (Ambr. De iis qui init. myst. c. 3.) Set aside your carnal imaginations of Christ covered with accidents, and his flesh chammed between your teeth, and say what you will either of his invisible presence by power and grace, or of the spiritual and effectual participation of his flesh and blood offered and received of the faithful by this sacrament for the quickening and preserving of their souls and bodies to eternal life, we join with you; no words shall displease us, that any way declare the truth or force of this mystery." [4]

But this presence is not supposed to be any real presence of the substance of Christ's Body in or under the elements, either of a natural or supernatural kind, as appears from many passages already quoted, and from the following, where he refers to the Fathers as delivering the true doctrine :—

"[The Fathers] taught Christ to be present *not in flesh but in grace; not in real and corporal existence, but in spiritual and fruitful efficience.* They prepared for him not their jaws and

[1] p. 757, ed. 1585; p. 601, ed. 1586.

[2] He calls it "local," as being *really* so, though denied by Romanists as by the Authors under review.

[3] p. 779, ed. 1585; p. 630, ed. 1586.

[4] p. 779, ed. 1585; p. 631, ed. 1586.

bellies, but their minds and hearts. They fetched him not down from heaven to spread him on a paten and shroud him in a pix, but exalted [? exhorted] all men to mount aloft with the wings of faith, *and there above in heaven (not here below in earth)* to behold the brightness of his glory, and taste the sweetness of his mercy. In proposing, urging, and repeating which doctrine, we find them most careful and diligent, most earnest and vehement; and that, if nothing else, will serve to convince your novelties. For *as that part of man, which eateth the flesh of Christ, everteth your real presence*, because no local or corporal substance can enter or feed the soul, and the truth of Christ's flesh in this mystery by the general consent of all ages and churches doth enter and feed the soul; SO THE PLACE WHITHER WE MUST ASCEND BEFORE WE CAN EAT THE LORD'S FLESH DOTH CLEARLY CONFUTE THE SAME. Where Christ is present, thither must our hearts be directed, when they are prepared to eat Christ. But the Church of God in her public prayers, and the Catholic Fathers in their writings, never taught the faithful to set their affections on the things before them, but to lift up their hearts from the Lord's Table to the highest heavens, where Christ sat at the right hand of his Father. *Ergo*, neither she believed, nor they professed, that Christ was *really closed under the forms of bread and wine*." [1]

"The Sacred Scriptures and Catholic Fathers affirm, that the true flesh of Christ is absent from earth, and verily present in heaven, whither we must and may send our hearts and faiths to be partakers of him, our hands and mouths we cannot send." [2]

"This is the presence of Christ which Chrysostom avoucheth, even *the influence of his (heavenly) grace;* and *that spiritual force and grace*, as Gregory saith, *may very well be construed to be the truth of his body and blood in the mysteries.* So that the same Christ is everywhere present, not by local or corporal diffusion, but *by mystical operation;* and one body is proposed to all, *not to fill their mouths, but to cleanse their hearts*, and to give them assurance of eternal life." [3]

Christ's body cannot be present in more than one place at the same time:—

Defending the position that the notion, "that the substance of Christ's body may be in many places at one time is *a con-*

[1] pp. 784, 785, ed. 1585; p. 638, ed. 1586.
[2] p. 786, ed. 1585; p. 640, ed. 1586.
[3] p. 793, ed. 1585; p. 649, ed. 1586.

demned heresy," he says in reply to his opponent's remark that "his body may be present in many places at one time,"—

"This you say, but what antient Father ever said so before you? yea rather why forget you that this is often refuted by them as a lewd and heretical fancy?"

And after quoting several he adds,—

"These be no wrested or maimed allegations, but grave and advised authorities of learned and antient Fathers, plainly concluding with us against you, that the flesh of Christ is *not absent only from earth, and now sitteth above at the right hand of God, but also locally contained in some one place of heaven by reason of the truth of his body;* and therefore not dispersed in many places or present in every place, as you would now make the world believe it is in your Masses. . . . . Human form and shape is inseparably joined to the substance of Christ's body; and Christ's human form by your confession cannot be present in many places at one time; *ergo*, neither his human substance. These twain, shape and substance, cannot be severed: he is no man that hath not the shape of man. . . . . The Lord Jesus as man must have not only the substance but also the shape of a man. 'So shall he come as you have seen him go to heaven,' that is, saith Austin, 'in the very same shape and substance of (his) flesh.' (Aug. Ep. 57.) 'Our vile body,' saith Paul, 'shall he change to be fashioned like to his glorious body.' (Phil. c. 3.) But our bodies shall then have distinction of parts, proportion of shape, circumscription of place: *ergo*, the glorified body of Christ hath and must have these very properties of our nature."

"Your *real presence* and ubiquity, if you will have Christ's human substance dispersed in many places, *without shape or circumscription*, are THE VERY BOWELS AND INWARDS OF EUTYCHES' HERESY.[1] . . . . PHI. We grant the manhood of Christ in heaven is local and circumscribed with place; and that setteth us free from Eutyches' error. THEO. It doth, *if you* CONSTANTLY KEEP *that point of faith, and contradict it not by another device.* PHI. We verily believe and publicly profess, that Christ's human nature in heaven hath quantity, shape, distinction of parts, circumscription, and all other conditions of a natural and true body. What would you more? THEO. We would no more; but if you fall from that, are you not within the compass of Eutyches' fury? PHI. We fall not from it. THEO. *Then how can Christ's body in the sacrament want all these,*

[1] He has similar remarks elsewhere, pp. 766—768, ed. 1585; pp. 612—615, ed. 1586.

which Christian religion affirmeth to be *permanent and perpetual in the manhood of Christ?* or why would you collect out of Ambrose or Chrysostom, against the very principles of faith, that Christ's human flesh is uncircumscribed, and everywhere diffused? PHI. We mean that of Christ's flesh in the sacrament, not of his manhood in heaven.... THEO. *Hath Christ two real and natural bodies, the one in heaven, the other in the sacrament?* PHI. No, this is all one with that. THEO. *That by the rules of your creed is local and circumscribed; if this be the same, how can this be without quantity, shape, and circumscription?* PHI. Believe you not Christ when he said, 'This is my body'? THEO. Yes verily; but you so expound his words, that you subvert the whole frame of his truth and our common faith with your real and local presence..... PHI. To say that his human nature is everywhere without any restraint, were indeed a branch of Eutyches' error. THEO. And since they [the Fathers] say so, you must either understand it of his divine nature, which is rightly and truly said to be everywhere present without addition, or else of *the spiritual and effectual presence* of his body which *entereth the souls* and strengtheneth the hearts of all the faithful by the power of his grace and truth of his promise. And either of these ways their words are very sound, and your local presence no part of their speech."[1]

Christ's body the same wherever it is:—

"PHI. May not the body of Christ in the sacrament be such as we defend, though his body in heaven be not? THEO. If the body of Christ in the sacrament be the very same that is in heaven, how can it so much differ from it? If it be another, how can it be his, since he hath but one natural body, and that by no means capable of such contrarieties as you imagine..... THEO. Confess you the distinction of two natures in Christ after his ascension? PHI. We do. THEO. And the properties of either to remain without confusion, conversion, or alteration? PHI. What else? THEO. This then is the Christian faith, that both natures in Christ now do and ever shall keep and continue their several and different proprieties without faling [failing] or changing. PHI. That we believe. THEO. How then can the manhood of Christ be in many places at one time? Or how can it in any place or time be without shape, quantity, circumscription, and such like proprieties of man's nature? PHI. In heaven it hath them. THEO. If they cannot be changed or altered, the manhood of Christ must have them; not in heaven only, but in

[1] pp. 788—792, ed. 1585; pp. 642—648, ed. 1586.

earth also, and in every place where the substance of his body is. PHI. Save in the sacrament.[1] THEO. If that be the same body which was on the cross, it must have the same natural proprieties of a body which that had. . . . . PHI. Cannot Christ be where he list without those consequents? THEO. *His body cannot.* . . . . The manhood of Christ, by the tenor of the Christian faith, hath and must have, after his ascension, human shape, parts, length, breadth, both extended and circumscribed: and otherwise to think is the wicked and cursed opinion of Eutyches, condemned long since by the Church of God for a mere impiety. You, to avoid the burthen of that sentence, confess these properties are and must be permanent in that body which our Saviour took of the Virgin, and wherein he now sitteth at the right-hand of God his Father. Mary, the self-same body you defend to be in the sacrament without shape, parts, length or breadth either extended or circumscribed, which is, we say, simply impossible. For shaped not shaped, extended not extended, circumscribed not circumscribed, be plain contradictions, and those of one thing, at one time, are not possible."[2]

Adoration due to Christ in the Eucharist, but not to a supposed presence in the elements:—

"S. Augustine saith of Christ's flesh which he took of the Virgin Mary, 'No man eateth that flesh of Christ, unless he first adore it.' . . . . What have S. Augustine's words to do with your adoring the mystical signs, when he directly nameth the flesh of Christ, which is both *eaten with the spirit, and adored in the spirit:* yea, THE VERY EATING OF IT IS THE ADORING OF IT, *since it is not eaten but by believing, hoping, and rejoicing in it,* which are the chief branches of God's divine honour. . . . . PHI. St. Ambrose saith, 'We adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries.' (De Spir. S. lib. 3. c. 12.) THEO. Verily and so do we; but *the mysteries and sacraments themselves we do not adore,* neither did St. Ambrose ever teach any man to adore them. PHI. I see you mistake us. You think we adore the forms of bread and wine, where indeed we do not, but rather we adore Christ the Son of the living God, and second Person in Trinity in those mysteries, as St. Ambrose saith, or *as*

[1] To this objection Bishop Bilson adds a marginal note,—"A very witty exception. Then you believe the Christian faith to be true everywhere saving in the sacrament, and what is that but wilfully and openly to deny the faith where you list?"

[2] pp. 793—796, ed. 1585; pp. 649—653, ed. 1586.

we speak more usually, under those forms of bread and wine.[1] THEO. I mistake you not. I know you adore that which is locally and really *enclosed within the compass of your host and chalice, supposing it in matter and substance to be the glorious body of Christ;* . . . . but your foundation we say is false, and therefore your building must needs be ruinous. Christ is present in the mysteries, not by the material substance of his body *closed within the forms of bread and wine*, but *by a divine and spiritual virtue and efficience*, NOT MIXING HIS SUBSTANCE WITH THE ELEMENTS, BUT ENTERING THE HEARTS OF THE FAITHFUL, and nourishing them with his spirit and grace to eternal life, the elements abiding in their proper and former essence and substance. . . . . Christ, you prove, is adored 'in the mysteries and on the altar.' Why should he not be adored in all places, and in all his gifts, and for all the monuments of his grace and mercy bequeathed us in this life, that he may prepare us for the next? And if this rule be general, how great cause have we to adore him in the water, where he cleanseth us from our sins; and at the Table, where he feedeth and strengtheneth our souls and spirits with their proper nourishment, which is the precious ransom that was paid to recover us from death and hell, and to bring us to his immortal light and bliss. What Christian heart recounting his abundant goodness and fatherly readiness with his own stripes to heal us, with his own blood to wash us, with his own death to quicken us, will not be resolved into prayers and tears to yield all honor and adoration to him that doth offer us these treasures at and on his Table?"[2]

BISHOP JEWEL.

Bishop Jewel is not cited in the Catena, but was referred to in the defence of Archdeacon Denison; and was referred to on a very important point, namely, the meaning of the word *sacrament*. And it has been authoritatively stated,[3] that Bishop Jewel was referred to as saying, that "the sense in which" the word *sacramentum* "was always used by the ancient Catholic

[1] If Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey need any further proof of the meaning of the phrase, "under the forms of bread and wine," than what has been given in the former part of this work, they may find it here.

[2] pp. 710, 711, ed. 1585; pp. 536—538, ed. 1586.

[3] See the Letter of Archdeacon Denison's Proctor, in *The Times* newspaper of July 29, 1856.

Fathers" was this, "viz. as the *signum*, the outward sign, and the *res sacramenti* the thing signified," "the benefits to those receiving worthily, being termed by ancient divines the *virtus sacramenti*."

Thus Bishop Jewel is brought in as a witness to prove, that Archdeacon Denison is correct in stating, that the word "sacramentum" always means the sign (the bread and wine) and the thing signified (the body and blood of Christ) joined together, and consequently that every one who receives the "sacramentum" must in that act receive these two things.

It is difficult to know what form of expression to use when such statements are made by those who come before the world as theologians; for if there is one thing more than another that Jewel constantly insists upon, it is, that the *sacrament*, in the sense of *the thing given by man*, is constantly severed from the *res sacramenti*, or thing signified. But it is best, perhaps, to leave all reflections upon the *character* of the reference to the reader, and keep to facts. Any one who has perused the former part of this volume, will see at once, that this is merely a reproduction of the marvellous blunder (for I should be sorry to suppose it could be anything else) into which Archdeacon Denison has been led (in his want of acquaintance, which *must*, in justice to him, be presumed, with the works of Bishop Jewel) by a writer whom he quotes.[1] The extracts from Jewel on this point were, in fact, read as they are given in the Archdeacon's second sermon from this writer. Now I have so fully met this matter in a former part of this work,[2] that it would be an abuse of the patience of the reader to go over the ground again. Suffice it to remind him here, that the blunder arises in this way. The Romanist Harding said that the word "sacrament" is sometimes taken of the Fathers to mean *the outward form* of the elements, i. e. the appearance when the substance has departed and given place to the substance of Christ's body and blood. Jewel of course strenuously denies that the Fathers ever called the outward form the sacrament, maintaining that they held the elements themselves, *including their substance*, to be the sacrament. Mr. Britton, ignorant, as we must suppose,

[1] Mr. Britton, in his Horæ Sacramentales.

[2] See *note* in pp. 651, 652, above.

of the Romish doctrine, and taking the phrase "outward forms" to mean the bread and wine, jumps at Jewel's denial of their being the sacrament, and sets him down as meaning, that the antient Fathers always maintained the *sacrament* to be *the sign with the thing signified joined together*. And the Archdeacon and his defenders blindly follow in the path to which he has thus led them.

But as the argument has been thus reproduced, I will here add a few lines from Jewel's comment on Harding's statement.

"Let M. Harding show us wherein and in what respect his *naked show of forms and accidents* can be the sacrament of Christ's body. . . . . The sign or signification of this sacrament, as St. Cyprian saith, standeth in refreshing and feeding. . . . . Hereof we may very well reason thus: The accidents or shows of bread and wine feed not our bodies as Christ's body feedeth our souls; Ergo, the accidents and shows of bread and wine are not the sacraments of Christ's body. Contrariwise, St. Cyprian, Irenæus, Rabanus, and other ancient Fathers, say; The substance of the bread feedeth our body, &c. Ergo, THE SUBSTANCE OF THE BREAD IS THE SACRAMENT OF CHRIST'S BODY." [1]

And proceeding even to ridicule the Romanists for not admitting that the *sacrament* is a figure of Christ's body (the very thing here denied by the Archdeacon) he says,—

"Sooner than they will confess, *as the ancient Catholic Fathers do*, that the sacrament is a figure of Christ's body, they are content to say, It is a sacrament before it be a sacrament, and so a figure before it be a figure. . . . . *Thus the old Fathers called the sacrament a sign or a figure of Christ's body after it was consecrate.*" [2]

So much for the point for which Jewel was referred to.

But it is somewhat remarkable that this should be the only reference made to Jewel's works. It might surely have been expected, that on a point on which Jewel has written so largely, an attempt should have been made to prove the consistency of the Archdeacon's views with the doctrine of our Church by a reference to Jewel's statements on the subject. On various grounds, which will readily occur to the reader, Jewel is no ordinary authority in such a matter. And it can hardly be

[1] JEWEL'S Reply to Hard. Art. 12. Wks. P. S. ed. ii. 596.
[2] Ibid. pp. 596, 597.

conceived that any doctrine which Jewel denounces as opposed to that of our Church, should nevertheless be consistent with it.

What, then, are Jewel's statements on the subject now under discussion? To give them at any length, would require a volume for the purpose. I am compelled to confine the extracts to a few short passages.

"The sacrament is the earthly thing: Christ's body is the heavenly thing. The sacrament is corruptible; Christ's body is glorious. The sacrament is laid upon the table: *Christ's body is in heaven.* The sacrament is received into our bodies; Christ's body is only received into our souls." [1]

"The sacrament is in the earth: Christ's body is in heaven. The sacrament is received by our bodily mouth: Christ's body is received *only by faith, which is the mouth of our soul. And whoso understandeth not this difference understandeth not the meaning of any sacrament.* . . . . The very body of Christ itself, *which is in heaven,* cannot be received but by faith only, and none otherwise." [2]

"Yet is it not the creature of bread or water, but the soul of man, that receiveth the grace of God. . . . The power of God, the grace of God, the presence of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, the gift of God, are not in the water, but in us." [3]

"Therefore wicked men, and such as believe not, *receive not the body of Christ:* they have no portion in it." [4]

"Now let us examine what difference is between the body of Christ and the sacrament of the body. . . . . The difference herein is this: a sacrament is a figure or token; the body of Christ is figured or tokened. The sacrament-bread is bread, it is not the body of Christ: the body of Christ is flesh, it is no bread. The bread is beneath, the body is above. The bread is on the table; the body is in heaven. The bread is in the mouth, the body in the heart. . . . . *The sacrament is eaten as well of the wicked as of the faithful: the body is only eaten of the faithful.* The sacrament may be eaten unto judgment; *the body cannot be eaten but unto salvation.* . . . . *Thus are we plainly taught by the Catholic learned Fathers to put a difference between the sacrament and the body of Christ;* AND THAT THE ONE OF THEM IS NOT REALLY LAPPED UP OR SHUT WITHIN THE OTHER; that the one, as Epiphanius

[1] Reply to Hard. Art. 21. Works, ii. 759.
[2] Ibid. Art. 23. ib. 786.
[3] Treatise of the Sacraments, Works, ii. 1102.
[4] Ibid. p. 1120.

saith, is utterly void of sense, the other whole sense, and whole sensible; that the one is received to destruction unto some, as St. Augustine saith, *the other is received of all men unto life;* that the one is a figure, as Chrysostom saith, the other a truth." [1]

"St. Paul saith: 'Whoso eateth unworthily of this bread, is guilty of the body and blood of Christ;' ergo (say you), 'Christ's body and blood must needs be really present.' Here, M. Harding, it were a worthy matter to see by what engines ye would prove these hasty conclusions, or how ye would force this guilt and this presence to go together. For think you that no man can be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, but he that hath Christ's body and blood really present in his hand? Verily, St. Augustine saith: 'He is guilty of no small price, but even of the blood of Christ, that (by fornication or advoutery) defileth his own soul that was made clean by the passion and blood of Christ.' Yet hath he not therefore 'Christ's blood really present.' .... This therefore is St. Paul's meaning, that the wicked, resorting unworthily to the holy mysteries, and having no regard what is meant thereby, despise the death and cross of Christ, and therefore are guilty of the Lord's body and blood, that are *represented* in the sacrament. .... To come near to the purpose, St. Augustine saith: 'Outwardly they have the sacrament of Christ's body; but the thing itself (which is Christ's body represented by the sacrament) inwardly in their hearts they have not. And therefore they eat and drink their own judgment.' Here St. Augustine saith, they are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not, the body of Christ. *Mark well these words, M. Harding: they are effectual. The wicked, by St. Augustine's judgment, are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ.*" [2]

And this is *immediately followed* by the following reference to that passage of Augustine which is cited in our 29th Article. Now as one great question at issue in the present controversy is, what doctrine that passage was quoted in the Article as maintaining, and as Bishop Jewel was not only an Episcopal member of the Convocation in 1571, in which this Article was added, but actually had the final revision of the Articles before publication committed to him, his judgment on the meaning of this passage is of primary importance; and it will be observed

[1] Treatise of the Sacraments. Works, ii. pp. 1121, 1122.
[2] Defence of Apol. Pt. v. c. 16. div. 1. Works, iv. 894, 895.

that he quotes it precisely as it stands in the Article, in that form which it is contended cannot mean what we attribute to it:—

"Again he saith: 'Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually his flesh, nor drinketh his blood; notwithstanding carnally (that is to say, with the bodily mouth) and visibly he do press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; and rather eateth and drinketh (*not Christ's very body and blood, but*) *the sacrament of so great a thing*, unto his judgment.' THESE WORDS, M. HARDING, BE SO PLAIN, THAT I CANNOT IMAGINE WHAT YE SHOULD MORE DESIRE. They are guilty of the blood of Christ, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouths." [1]

And he proceeds to reply to the very argument of the Archdeacon, as to the difference between *real* receiving and *effectual* receiving, as urged by Harding;—

"*The distinction that you imagine between real receiving in the wicked, and effectual receiving in the godly, as it is only of yourself, without the authority of any doctor, Greek or Latin, so is it nothing else but a very 'effectual' and 'real' folly. For* THE VERY BODY OF CHRIST, IF IT BE NOT EFFECTUALLY RECEIVED, IS NOT RECEIVED. Christ himself saith; 'He that eateth me shall live by me.'" [2]

And having added some other passages of Ambrose and Augustine, he adds,—

"Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the wicked *receive not the body of Christ*." [3]

And when speaking of the sacrament in the sense, not of that which is received into the mouth, but of the ordinance as consisting of two parts, an outward and an inward, he says,—

"Therefore it is certain and most manifest by Irenæus, that, as Christ's body is the one part of the sacrament, so is material bread the other. Likewise in baptism, as the one part of that holy mystery is Christ's blood, so is the other part the material water. *Neither are these parts joined together in place, but in mystery; and therefore* THEY BE OFTENTIMES SEVERED, AND THE ONE IS RECEIVED WITHOUT THE OTHER." [4]

[1] Ibid. p. 895. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.
[4] Reply to Harding. Art. viii. Works, i. 519.

These passages, taken from various parts of his works, and only a brief specimen of hundreds of similar passages that might be quoted, may serve to show the reader the *character* of the reference that has been made to Bishop Jewel.

The reader who wishes to go further into the question of Jewel's doctrine, may turn to the fifth, sixth, and twelfth Articles of his Reply to Harding, in the two former of which he will find Jewel expressly and formally refuting the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the consequent multipresence of Christ's body, as held by the Authors under review; and in the last, maintaining that the sacrament, in the sense of the consecrated *res sacra* on the Table, is only a figure of the body of Christ.

On the question of the Real Presence, I have already shown that he *repudiates the very name*.[1] And he repeats over and over again such statements as, "The bread is in the earth, "*Christ's body is in heaven;*"[2] "It is a holy mystery and "a heavenly action, forcing our minds up into heaven, and "there teaching us to eat the body of Christ and to drink his "blood; not outwardly by the service of our bodies, but in-"wardly by our faith, and that verily and in deed."[3] And the "real presence" for which Harding was contending was *precisely that of the Authors under review;* for Harding's own words are, that Christ's body is in the sacrament, "*not after corporal, carnal, or natural wise,* but invisibly, unspeakably, miraculously, supernaturally, spiritually, divinely, and by way to him only known."[4]

Again, as to the multipresence of Christ's body, we find Harding urging all those arguments we have before considered in a former part of this work, as adduced by Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey,[5] and Jewel disposing of them as utterly futile.

Some of his remarks on this point I have already quoted, when discussing the arguments alleged on it by the Authors under review.[6]

I add here one more extract:—

"For like as the body or compass of the sun, being in one

[1] See p. 591, above. [2] Works i. 453. [3] Ibid. p. 475.
[4] Ibid. p. 455. [5] See pp. 131 et seq. above. [6] See pp. 164, 165, above.

certain place of the heavens, reacheth out his beams, and giveth influence unto the world; even so Christ, the sun of justice, being in heaven in one place at the right hand of God, likewise reacheth out his beams, and giveth his influence into the faithful, and so feedeth them, not by bare imagination or fantasy, but truly, substantially, and indeed. .... And as the sun not coming down from heaven, nor leaving his place, is nevertheless present with us in our houses, in our faces, in our hands, and in our bosoms; even so Christ, being in heaven, not coming down, nor leaving his room there, yet nevertheless is present with us in our congregations, in our hearts, in our prayers, in the mystery of baptism, and in the sacrament of his body and blood." [1]

Again, the whole of the twelfth Article[2] is written expressly to show that the words of institution, "This is my body," &c., are to be interpreted figuratively; which alone determines his view of the whole matter. And in it he says,—

"And where he [i. e. Harding] saith the sacraments of the New Testament *contain covertly under them the thing itself that they signify*, and that according to Christ's promise, verily this saying covertly containeth *a great untruth*." [3]

I conclude with Jewel's answer to two common cavils.

"To force onward his matter, he [i. e. Harding] saith; 'Properly and truly to speak, how can we eat Christ's body by faith?' Here it might have pleased M. Harding to remember, that these phrases, 'to eat Christ,' 'to drink Christ,' 'to digest Christ,' 'to be fed with Christ,' 'to dwell in Christ,' 'to be clad with Christ,' 'to be graft in Christ,' and other the like, are not plain, ordinary, usual, and common speeches; but mystically and covertly uttered under a figure, thereby to give us to understand that Christ is our spiritual meat, our spiritual drink, our spiritual sustenance, our spiritual house, our spiritual robe, and our spiritual stock." [4]

"M. Harding argueth further: 'Christ's body is so received as it is present; but it is present by bread and wine (ye say); ergo, it is received by bread and wine; to conclude, if by bread and wine, then not by faith only. If M. Harding had better considered the rules of his old sophistry, he might soon have seen the wants and deformities of this reason. Amongst children it is called *ignoratio elenchi*, which is the simplest *fallax* of all the rest. It is true that

[1] Ibid. p. 499. [2] Works ii. 590—624. [3] Ibid. p. 602.
[4] Def. of Apol. Pt. ii. 13. 1. Works, iii. 486.

of our part it is not either our hand or our mouth, but faith only, that receiveth the body of Christ; but the same body of Christ is offered and represented unto our faith by mean of the sacraments. We speak of such instruments of receiving as are of ourself, and be within us; M. Harding answereth of the sacraments that be external instruments, and are wholly without us. So in baptism, notwithstanding we have Christ present of our part 'only by faith,' yet St. Augustine saith, as it is said before, 'We have Christ present by the sacrament of baptism.' *Thus is Christ present unto us, of his part 'only by his grace;' of our part, 'only by our faith;'* BY THE SACRAMENTS ONLY AS BY MEAN OF OUTWARD INSTRUMENTS TO MOVE OUR SENSES."[1]

Bishop Andrewes.

The extracts given from Bishop Andrewes[2] prove nothing more than that he maintained a real presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist *in some way*, our controversy with Rome, as with the Authors under review, being as to *what that way is;* and further, that there is a *change* produced upon the elements by consecration: both which points are freely granted, for there is a great change of *character* and *use* in the elements. In fact, we have just seen Calvin himself using the same language, observing that "the question is only *of the manner*" of the presence.[3]

They who understand the nature of the Sacramentarian controversy, know well, that such expressions afford not the slightest ground for imagining, that those who use them approximate to such a doctrine of the Real Presence as that maintained by the Authors under review. Let us go, for instance, to the celebrated Lutheran divine Gerhard, and we shall find him expressly pointing out, that this phrase is used and insisted upon by those who *oppose* the notion of the presence on earth of the substance of Christ's body in *any* form, both among the Anglican divines and those of the Reformed Churches on the Continent.[4] He, like the Romanists and the Authors under

[1] Ibid. pp. 487, 488.

[2] Doct. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. 1. pp. 48—51. Pt. 2. pp. 14—16.

[3] See p. 745, above.

[4] Gerhard, Loci Theolog. loc. xxii. c. 11. § 104. ed. Cotta, tom. x. pp. 179 et seq.

review, of course thinks that the phrase is improperly used by them, and that they give an unorthodox and incorrect meaning to it,[1] but he attempts not to fix his own doctrine upon them *because of their use of the phrase*. And among them he mentions *Bishop Andrewes himself*, as quoted by Isaac Casaubon in his Reply to Perron, and with reference to the very passage which is the first and chief of those quoted in the *Catena*.[2] Here therefore we certainly have an impartial testimony that these words of Bishop Andrewes do by no means commit him to the doctrine here opposed.

And certainly Casaubon, in his Reply to Cardinal Perron's Letter, written at the King's command, a very short time after these words were written by Bishop Andrewes, interpreted them in the same way; for after quoting the words, and adding, "This is the faith of the King, this is the faith of the Church of England," he proceeds to attribute the reception and manducation entirely to *faith*.[3]

When he says, "We believe a presence, and a true one, no less than you,"[4] he says nothing more than what even Calvin and others of the same school have said. And when he adds, —"Of the mode of the presence we define nothing rashly, I add, neither need we anxiously inquire; no more than, in our baptism, *how the blood of Christ cleanses us*,"[5] he clearly parallels the presence of the blood of Christ in baptism with the presence

[1] Huic sententiæ de vera reali et substantiali corporis et sanguinis Christi in sacra cœna præsentia strenue obloquuntur Calviniani, non uno tamen eodemque modo. Quidam enim aperte absque ullis verborum involucris profitentur, quod in corde statuunt, videlicet ἀπουσίαν corporis et sanguinis Christi. .... Quidam contra τὰ σκληρὰ μαλθακῶς proferre edocti ὄμοια μὲν λέγουσι, ἀνόμοια δὲ φρονοῦσι, ægre enim ferunt sibi tribui sententiam de ἀπουσίᾳ corporis, 'cum non de ipsa præsentia, sed de modo saltem præsentiæ quæstionem esse' scribant, ideo student phrases ecclesiæ imitari," &c. ID. ibid. p. 181.

[2] He refers also to the statement of the celebrated Calvinistic divine of our Church, Dr. Perkins, in his "Reformed Catholic," c. x., that there is "a true and real presence" of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper, and that we differ from the Romanists, "not touching the presence itself, but only in *the manner of presence*."

[3] In cœna Domini realiter participem se fieri credit corporis et sanguinis Christi. .... *Per fidem enim Christum apprehendunt et manducant.* IS. CASAUBON. ad Epist. C. Perron. Respons. Lond. 1612. 4to, p. 51.

[4] Præsentiam credimus, nec minus quam vos veram. Respons. ad Bellarm. c. 1. ed. 1610. p. 11; ed. Ox. 1851. p. 13.

[5] De modo præsentiæ nihil temere definimus, addo, nec anxie inquiramus; non magis quam, in baptismo nostro, quomodo abluat nos sanguis Christi. Ibid.

of his body and blood in the Eucharist. This is the inference of our own Archbishop Wake from these words, when they had been quoted by Woodhead for the same purpose for which they are quoted in the Catena. "He plainly insinuates," says Archbishop Wake on these words, "that the presence of Christ in "the Eucharist was much the same as in Baptism; the very allu- "sion which the Holy Fathers were wont to make to express "his presence by in this holy sacrament; which since our ad- "versaries can neither deny, nor yet say is so real as to be es- "sential or corporeal, they must of necessity allow, that there "may be a true presence (which is all the Bishop affirms) with- "out such a substantial one as this author here contends "for."[1]

And Archbishop Wake proceeds to refer to a passage in Bishop Andrewes's seventh sermon on the Resurrection, observing on it, "that, whatever this Bishop understood by the *Real Presence*, "it could not be that Christ's glorified Body is now actually "present in this sacred mystery, will appear demonstratively "from this, that he declares it is not this Body which we "either represent or partake of there." The passage he quotes is this:—

"Will ye mark one thing more: That *epulemur* doth here refer to *immolatus;* to Christ not every way considered, but as when he was offered. Christ's body that now is, true; but not Christ's body *as now it is*, but *as then it was*, when it was offered, rent and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not, as now he is, glorified; for so he is not, so he cannot be *immolatus;* for he is immortal and impassible; but, as then he was when he suffered death, that is, passible and mortal. Then, in his passible state, did he institute this of ours, to be a memorial of his *passibile* and *passio* both. And we are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*sursum corda*),[2] but we are also carried back to Christ, as he was at the very instant and in the very act of his offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text [1 Cor. v. 7, 8.] teach; so, and no otherwise, do we represent him. By the incomprehensible power of his Eternal Spirit, not he alone,

[1] Wake's Disc. of the Holy Eucharist, c. 2. ed. 1687. 4to. p. 62. In this discourse Archbishop Wake is expressly refuting the notion, that that doctrine of the Real Presence which is maintained by the Authors under review has any support from the writings of our divines.

[2] Archbishop Wake, in quoting this passage, adds here the remark,—"*so that Christ it seems is not brought down to us.*"

but he as at the very act of his offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into his death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an Host could be turned into him now glorified as he is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it. Thither we must look; to the Serpent lift up; thither we must repair; even *ad cadaver:* we must *hoc facere*, do that is then done. So and no otherwise is this *epulare* to be conceived. And so I think none will say they do or can turn him." [1]

Upon this passage Archbishop Wake makes this remark:—

"Whatsoever Real Presence then this Bishop believed, it must be of his *crucified Body*, and as in the state of his *death;* and that I think cannot be otherwise *present* than in one of those two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge; *either figuratively, in the elements, or spiritually in the souls of those who worthily receive them.*" [2]

And this view of his doctrine is borne out by other passages in his sermons.

Thus, after speaking of our *touching* Christ in the Eucharist, he clearly explains in the following words, how he supposes such acts to be done:—

"Now, if faith be to touch, that will touch him *no less in heaven than here; one that is in heaven may be touched so.* No ascending can hinder that touch. Faith will elevate itself, that ascending in spirit we shall touch him, and take hold of him. *Mitte fidem et tenuisti*—it is St. Augustine. It is a touch to which there is never a *noli;* fear it not. So do we then; send up our faith, and that shall touch him, and then will virtue come from him," &c.[3]

Again, he speaks in precisely similar terms of the presence of the blood of Christ in Baptism as of its presence in the Eucharist. He says,—

"Now then, his [Christ's] blood, after it had by the very pouring it out wrought these two effects, it ran not waste, but divided into two streams. 1. One into 'the laver of the new birth'—our baptism, applied to us outwardly to take away the spots of our sin. 2. The other, into 'the cup of the New Testament in his blood,'

[1] Sermons, ed. 1641. fol. p. 454; ed. Oxf. 8vo. vol. 2. pp. 301, 302.

[2] Wake, ut supra, p. 63. Our learned Bishop Morton, a *contemporary* of Bishop Andrewes, gives, in his "Decisio controversiæ de Eucharistia," the same representation of his doctrine.

[3] Serm. xv. Of the resurrection. Serm. Oxf. ed. vol. iii. pp. 34—38.

which inwardly administered serveth, as to purge and 'cleanse the conscience from dead works,' that so live works may grow up in the place, so to endue us with the Spirit that shall enable us with the power to bring them forth." [1]

And he clearly tells us, that the heavenly food in the Eucharist is (not orally, but) *spiritually* received:—

"'Spiritus est ultimum alimenti,' 'the uttermost perfection of nourishment.' In which respect he instituted *escam spiritualem*, 'spiritual food,' to that end; *so called spiritual*, not so much *for that it is received spiritually*, as for that being so received it maketh us, together with it, to receive the Spirit, even *potare Spiritum*—it is the Apostle's own word." [2]

And that Christ's flesh is in heaven, and that he is present with us now only through the operation of his Spirit, he expressly asserts,—

"So then man he carried up to heaven, God [i. e. the Holy Spirit] he sent down to earth; *our flesh is there with God*, His Spirit here with us." [3]

And the body and blood we receive are, he tells us, the gifts *left us at his ascension*, in strict accordance with the statement contained in the first passage quoted from him:—

"There ever was and will be a near alliance between his 'dona dedit hominibus' and his 'dona reliquit hominibus,' 'the gifts he sent' and 'the gifts he left us.' He *left us the gifts of his body and blood:* his body broken, and full of the characters of love all over: his blood shed, every drop whereof is a great drop of love."

And he then adds remarks clearly showing his view of the character of the Eucharistic rite:—

'To those which were sent, these which were left, love, joy, peace, have a special connatural reference, to breed and to maintain each other. His body the Spirit of strength, his blood the Spirit of comfort; both, the Spirit of love. This Spirit, we said, we are to procure, that it may abide with us and be in us. And what is more intrinsical in us, abideth surer, groweth faster to us, than what we eat and drink? Then, *if we could get 'a spiritual meat,' or get 'to drink of the Spirit,'* there were no way [like] to that. *And*

[1] Serm. xviii. Of the Resurrection. Ibid. pp. 101, 102.
[2] Serm. ii. Of the sending of the Holy Ghost. Ibid. pp. 143, 144.
[3] Serm. vii. ibid. pp. 232, 233.

behold here they be. For here is 'spiritual meat,' that is breeding the Spirit; and here we are all made 'drink of one Spirit,' that there may be but one Spirit in us. And we are all made 'one bread and one body,' kneaded together, and pressed together into one—as the symbols are, the bread and the wine—so many as are partakers of one bread and one cup, 'the bread of life,' and 'the cup of blessing,' the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." [1]

The following passage also is quite inconsistent with the notion that the real body and blood of Christ are conjoined to the elements, and favors only a *virtual* presence in them:—

"He that breathed, and he that was breathed, both of them vouchsafe to *breathe into those holy mysteries a Divine power and virtue, and make them to us the bread of life and the cup of salvation.*" [2]

Again, elsewhere he speaks of the presence of "blood" in Baptism as much as in the Eucharist:—

"In Baptism we are washed with 'water:' that 'water' is not without 'blood.' The 'blood' serves instead of 'nitre.' He hath 'washed us from our sins in his blood'—'washed.' They made their robes 'white in the blood of the Lamb.' No washing, no whiting by 'water,' without 'blood.' *And in the Eucharist we are made drink of the blood of the New Testament,* but in that blood there is water, 'for the blood of Christ purifieth us from our sins.'" [3]

He evidently considers the blood of Christ to oe just as much present in the one rite as in the other, and the whole sermon shows in what sense he uses such phrases.

And, finally, he distinctly limits the eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood in the Eucharist to the worthy recipient; for, speaking of the Eucharist, he says,—

"There we are made to 'drink of the Spirit,' there our 'hearts are strengthened and stablished with grace.' There is the blood which shall 'purge our consciences from dead works,' whereby we may 'die to sin.' There the Bread of God, which shall endue our souls with much strength; yea, multiply strength in them, to live unto God; yea, to live to him continually; for he that 'eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him;' not inneth, or sojourneth for a time, but dwelleth continually." [4]

[1] Ibid. pp. 238, 239. [2] Serm. ix. ibid. p. 279.
[3] Serm. xiii. Of the sending of the Holy Ghost. ibid. p. 352.
[4] Serm. i. Of the Resurrection. Sermons, Oxf. ed. vol. 2. p. 205.

And when he says, that "the 'bread which we break is the "partaking of Christ's' true 'body,'—and not of a sign, figure, "or remembrance of it; for the Church hath ever believed a "true fruition of the true body of Christ in that sacrament;"[1] he says nothing more than what we should all strenuously contend for; for when we partake of the bread, we partake of that which is not a mere sign, but an effectual and operative sign, instrumental by Divine promise for putting the believer in communion with the true and real body of Christ. There is to the believer a true fruition of the true body of Christ in the Eucharist.

And hence we may see the real meaning of the passage quoted from Bishop Andrewes,[2] to prove that he advocated the adoration of Christ as contained in the consecrated *res sacra* on the Table. His words are these:—

"In 'the adoration of the sacrament' Bellarmine sadly stumbles at the very threshold. He says, 'of the sacrament, that is, of Christ the Lord present in a wonderful but true way in the sacrament.' But away with this. Who will grant him this? 'Of the sacrament, that is, of Christ in the sacrament.' Truly Christ himself the *res sacramenti*, both in and with the sacrament, out of and without the sacrament, wheresoever he is, is to be adored. But the King [James I.] maintained that Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, and truly to be adored, to wit, the *res sacramenti;* but not the sacrament, to wit, 'the earthly part,' as Irenæus calls it, 'the visible' as Augustine. But we also adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries, with Ambrose; and not *that thing*, but *him* who is worshipped above the altar [or, him who is above the altar do we worship]. For the Cardinal incorrectly inquires, '*What* is there worshipped,' when he ought to have inquired '*Who*.' Since Nazianzen says *him*, not *it*. And 'we eat not the flesh without first adoring it,' with Augustine. But yet we none of us adore *the sacrament*."[3]

[1] Serm. ii. Of the Worshipping of Imaginations. Sermons, Oxf. ed. vol. i. p. 67.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. 1. p. 50. The passage, it will be observed, is most imperfectly, and even incorrectly, quoted.

[3] "In 'adoratione sacramenti' ad limen ipsum turpiter impingit. 'Sacramenti' ait, id est 'Christi Domini in sacramento, miro sed vero modo præsentis.' Apage vero. Quis ei hoc dederit? 'Sacramenti, id est, Christi in sacramento.' Imo Christus ipse sacramenti res, in et cum sacramento, extra et sine sacramento, ubi ubi est, adorandus est. Rex autem Christum in Eucharistia vere præsentem, vere et adorandum statuit, rem scilicet sacramenti; at non sacramentum, 'terrenam' scilicet 'partem,' ut Irenæus; 'visibilem,' ut Augustinus.

Upon this passage, as quoted for the very purpose for which it is cited in the Catena, Archbishop Wake truly observes,—

"How this Bishop thought Christ truly present in the sacrament we have seen before; and may from thence easily conclude how he supposed he might be adored there, viz., as in all other holy offices, in which we confess him by his Divine power to be present with us, but especially in this sacred mystery. And thus we all adore him, both in and with and without the sacrament; we confess him to be truly present, and therefore truly to be adored by us. But now for Christ's natural body (of which, and not of Christ himself, our dispute is), if that be any otherwise truly present than as we before showed, let it be remembered, that according to this Bishop it must not be his glorified body, his body as it now is; but his body crucified, his body as offered for us, and in the state of his death; so he expressly affirms; and this I believe our author himself will confess in his sense to be *impossible*." [1]

In fact, it is clear that if the Bishop had meant that Christ was to be worshipped as in or under the elements lying on the table, the only question between him and Bellarmine would have been, whether the substance of the bread remained or only its outward form, for Bellarmine did not advocate worship to the sacramental signs. But the Bishop evidently had a further ground of difference with him, namely, as to the worship being addressed to the *res sacra* on the table as containing the body of Christ. And from his "Answer to the XVIII. Chapter of Cardinal Perron's Reply," his real doctrine on this point is manifest, for the first section is against the notion of "the belief of Christ in the sacrament *sub speciebus*," and the second is against "the external adoration of the sacrament," [2] in which he points out that the Cardinal's quotations from the Fathers to prove that they considered divine worship due to the sacrament as containing the body of Christ are not in his favor, [3]

Nos vero et 'in mysteriis carnem Christi adoramus,' cum Ambrosio: et non, '*id*,' sed 'eum qui super altare colitur [? colimur].' Male enim, 'quid ibi colatur,' quærit Cardinalis, cum 'quis,' debuit; cum Nazianzenus 'eum' dicat, non 'id.' Nec 'carnem manducamus, quin adoremus prius,' cum Augustino. Et sacramentum tamen nulli adoramus. Resp. ad Apol. Bellarm. ed. 1610. p. 195. ed. Oxf. 1851. pp. 266, 267.

[1] WAKE, ut supra cit. pp. 88, 89.

[2] Opusc. Posthuma. Lond. 1629. 4to. "Answer," &c. pp. 1—4, and 20, 21; or, Minor Works, Oxf. ed. pp. 13—17, and 34, 35.

[3] His remarks on the passages quoted with this view from Cyril of Jerusalem, and Augustine, and Theodoret, may be seen in pp. 488 and 509, and 585, above.

and that all we admit is, that the sacrament is to be received with due reverence and respect. His statements here, therefore, are directly opposed to Archdeacon Denison's assertion, that "worship is due to the real, though invisible and supernatural, presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine."

Richard Hooker.

Among the Authors of this period quoted in the Catena and for the defence of Archdeacon Denison, occurs Richard Hooker, Master of the Temple. About twelve pages of the Catena[1] are devoted to extracts from the 5th book of his Ecclesiastical Polity, from which were taken those read on the trial; and it is difficult to understand how any one can read even those extracts, and not see that Hooker's doctrine is entirely opposed to that doctrine of the Real Presence in support of which these passages are cited. But it would seem as if the compiler had no notion that certain phrases, such as "really present," &c., could be used in any but one sense, and that his mind was so accustomed to interpret these phrases only in that sense, that he took no notice of the statements connected with them.

A few passages showing Hooker's real views will be sufficient for our purpose.

And first as to the impossibility of the substance of Christ's body being present in more places than one, which cuts up the doctrine of the Authors under review by the roots. On this point I have already given some extracts from Hooker,[2] but I will here add another :—

"The substance of the body of Christ hath no presence, neither can have, but only local. . . . . There is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a true body but by the true and natural properties of his body. Amongst which properties definite or local presence is chief. . . . . If his majestical body have now any such new property, by force whereof it may everywhere really even in substance present itself, or may *at once be in many places*, then hath the majesty of his estate extinguished the verity of his nature."[3]

[1] Pt. i. pp. 32—44. [2] See p. 50. above. [3] Eccl. Pol. bk. v. ch. 55, 56.

And he then quotes Augustine to show that this is not the case.

He then proceeds to point out, that Christ's body, though absent in substance, may yet in more than one way be said to be, *in a sense, present*. Thus—

"Because this substance is inseparably joined to that personal Word which by his very Divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence, hath it *after a sort* by being nowhere severed from that which everywhere is present;" and "presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence." [1]

And further,—

"Forasmuch as it is by virtue of that conjunction made the body of the Son of God, by whom also it was made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, this giveth it *a presence of force and efficacy* throughout all generations of men." [2]

And then, having proceeded to describe the close and intimate communion that is established between the human nature of Christ and the believer, he adds,—

"And because the divine substance of Christ is equally in all, *his human substance equally distant from all*, it appeareth that the participation of Christ wherein there are many degrees and differences, must needs consist in such effects as being derived from both natures of Christ really into us, are made our own, and we by having them in us are truly said to have him from whom they come, Christ, also more or less to inhabit and impart himself as the graces are fewer or more, greater or smaller, which really flow into us from Christ." [3]

These passages then uproot the very foundations of what the Authors under review call the doctrine of the Real Presence. Hooker maintains that Christ's body cannot be so present.

And now let us proceed to his statements respecting the Eucharist.

He first points out that the great question at issue between the various parties into which the Christian world is divided on this subject is this,—

"Whether when the sacrament is administered, Christ be whole

[1] Bk. v. ch. lv. 7. [2] Ibid. § 9. [3] Ibid. ch. lvi. 10.

within man only, or else his body and blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated elements themselves; [the doctrine for which the Authors under review are contending] which opinion," he adds, "they that defend are driven either to consubstantiate and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental, or to transubstantiate and change their substance into his." [1]

Archdeacon Denison may here see, that Hooker considers any man who holds that the body and blood of Christ are seated in the elements themselves to be necessarily committed to the doctrine either of Consubstantiation or Transubstantiation.

Now Hooker's doctrine is so clearly expressed in the following passage, that the temerity displayed in quoting him in defence of Archdeacon Denison is really marvellous.

"If we doubt what those admirable words [*i. e.* "This is my body," &c.] may import, let him be our teacher for the meaning of Christ to whom Christ was himself a schoolmaster, let our Lord's Apostle be his interpreter, content we ourselves with his explication, My body, *the communion of my body*, My blood, *the communion of my blood*. Is there anything more expedite, clear and easy, than that as Christ is termed our life because through him we obtain life, so the parts of this sacrament are his body and blood for that they are so to us who receiving them receive *that* by them which they *are termed?* The bread and cup are his body and blood because they are *causes instrumental* upon the receipt whereof the participation of his body and blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect is not vainly nor improperly *said to be* that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it. Our souls and bodies quickened to eternal life are effects the cause whereof is the Person of Christ, his body and blood are the true well-spring out of which this life floweth. So that his body and blood are in that very subject whereunto they minister life not only by effect or operation, even as the influence of the heavens is in plants, beasts, men, and in everything which they quicken, but also by a far more divine and mystical kind of union, which maketh us one with him even as he and the Father are one. THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S MOST BLESSED BODY AND BLOOD IS NOT THEREFORE TO BE SOUGHT FOR IN THE

[1] Ibid. ch. lxvii. 2. It must be observed, that Hooker is only stating here what he considers the *leading* point at issue. The question as to the nature of the presence he had before considered, and shown that there cannot be a *substantial* presence of Christ's body on earth in the Eucharistic rite, either to the elements or the communicants.

SACRAMENT, BUT IN THE WORTHY RECEIVER OF THE SACRAMENT.

And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth, first, 'take and eat;' then, 'This is my Body which was broken for you:' first, 'drink ye all of this;' then followeth, 'This is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' *I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is his body or the cup his blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them.* As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow. If on all sides it be confessed, that the grace of baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it, although it be neither seated in the water, nor the water changed into it, what should induce men to think, that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be in the Eucharist before it can be in us that receive it? The fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the body and blood of Christ. There is no sentence of Holy Scripture which saith, that we cannot by this sacrament be made partakers of his body and blood except they be first contained in the sacrament, or the sacrament converted into them."[1]

A plainer or more decisive passage it would be impossible to conceive. And the way in which the Compiler of the Catena deals with it, is this. He quotes the beginning of the passage down to the words "even as he and the Father are one." The remainder, commencing with the decisive words, "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is *not* therefore to be sought for *in the sacrament*," &c., he *wholly omits*; and at the end of his extracts subjoins this extraordinary note:—

"There are other passages in which Hooker uses the words 'real presence' and the 'body and blood of Christ' (as St. Augustine had done before) as synonymous with the *virtue* of the sacrament, or of 'the benefits of which we are partakers thereby;' as where he says, that 'the real presence of Christ's most holy body and blood' is 'only to be found in the worthy receiver of the sacrament,' and 'in the very heart and soul of him who receiveth.' Book v. c. 57. A more strictly dogmatic teaching was soon after introduced into the Church Catechism."[2]

[1] Ibid. ch. lxvii. 5, 6. [2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c Pt. i. p. 44.

It is painful to have to deal with statements such as these. Their *character* I leave the reader to determine. The plain statement of Hooker (after an elaborate argument on the point), that the presence is "*not in the sacrament*"—the very question at issue—is *concealed*, and the words that it is "in the worthy receiver," and "only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth," are glossed over as merely meaning that only the worthy receiver derives *benefit* from the reception!

If space permitted it, I should gladly quote more of Hooker's remarks on the subject; but there is one passage, in which he traces the grounds on which the doctrine of Consubstantiation is rested, which so accurately describes the mode of reasoning followed by the Authors under review, that it seems worth while to add it.

"When they which have this opinion of Christ in that blessed sacrament go about to explain themselves, and to open after what manner things are brought to pass, the one sort lay the union of Christ's Deity with his manhood as their first foundation and ground; from thence they infer a power which the body of Christ hath *thereby* to present itself in all places; out of which ubiquity of his body they gather the presence thereof with that sanctified bread and wine of our Lord's table; the conjunction of his body and blood with those elements they use as an argument to show, how the bread may as well in that respect be termed his body, because his body is therewith joined, as the Son of God may be named man by reason that God and man in the person of Christ are united; to this they add, how the words of Christ commanding us to eat must needs import, that as he hath *coupled the substance of his flesh and the substance of bread together*, so we together should receive both; which *labyrinth*"—he adds, passing on to the supporters of the doctrine of Transubstantiation—"as the other sort doth justly shun, so the way which they take to the same inn is somewhat more short, but no whit more certain. For through God's omnipotent power they imagine that transubstantiation followeth upon the words of consecration, and upon transubstantiation the participation of Christ's both body and blood in the only shape [*i. e.* unsubstantial form and appearance] of sacramental elements." [1]

His testimony as to the doctrine of the Fathers on the subject, I have already given in a previous page.[2]

[1] Ibid. ch. lxvii. 10.

[2] See pp. 415, 416 above.

Bishop Overall.

Another witness quoted in the Catena,[1] and strongly insisted upon in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, is Bishop Overall. The quotations from him in the Catena, and repeated from the Catena in the defence, are derived from three sources,—first, the additional Notes appended to Nicholls's Comment on the Book of Common Prayer; — secondly, Knox's Remains; — thirdly, a Letter of Bishop Overall to Grotius. I shall consider each of these classes of quotations separately.

First, as to the passages cited from the additional Notes to Nicholls's Comment on the Prayer Book as having been written by Bishop Overall. Respecting these, though adduced with such confidence, and pressed as having all the weight which Overall's name and position could give them, it is only necessary to inform the reader, that they were no more written by Bishop Overall than by himself, and that the Compiler of the Catena, unless he took them at second-hand, must have been aware of this. For, in the first place, the statement prefixed to these Notes by Dr. Nicholls is, that they are "MSS. Notes written in an interleaved Common Prayer Book, in the Bishop of Durham's Library, printed in the year 1619, SUPPOSED to be made *from the Collections of Bishop Overall*, BY A FRIEND OR CHAPLAIN OF HIS."[2] And in two of these Notes occur statements showing that Bishop Overall was *not* the author of them, and that, though they were written by some one who was a Chaplain or other person attendant on Overall, they do not profess to be given from his papers. For in the Note on "O Lord and heavenly Father," it is said,—"in regard whereof I have always observed my Lord and Master Dr. Overall to use this oblation in its right place," &c.[3]

And again, immediately after the strongest passage given in the Catena, — namely, "I cannot see where any real difference "is betwixt us [the English Church and the Romanists] about "this Real Presence, if we would give over the study of contra-

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 65—71.

[2] See Dr. Nicholls's Comment on the Book of Common Prayer. Lond. 1710. fol. Additional Notes, p. 2. Explication of marks.

[3] Ibid. p. 49.

"diction, and understand one another aright"—these words follow;—"Maldonate de Sacr. p. 143, after a long examination "of the matter, concludes thus at last with us all, so the words "be not taken *exclusivè*, as the Puritans will take them, "'Corpus Christi sumitur a nobis sacramentaliter, spiritualiter "et realiter, sed non corporaliter,' and *so have I heard my Lord "Overall preach it an hundred times.*"[1]

This at least decides the authorship of the Notes, that is, that they were neither written by Overall, nor claim the authority of being derived from his papers. By whom they were written cannot now probably be ascertained, but certainly it was not Bishop Cosin, who was Overall's chaplain, because his Notes, as we shall see presently, are of a very different kind.

The fact that the author was led to think, by the words he quotes from Maldonate (which are exactly like those we have just seen used by Harding in his Controversy with Jewel[2]), that the Popish doctrine and ours must be the same, only shows his ignorance of the nature of the controversy; and he might very probably have heard Bishop Overall use the same terms a hundred times, as he might have heard Bishop Jewel do so, without committing himself in the least to the Romish doctrine of the Real Presence. All depends upon *the sense attached to these words;* so much so that even the word *corporally* has been used in a thoroughly Protestant sense; as by our Martyr, Bradford.[3]

I may add, that some of the Notes seem hardly to be written with a view to the Services of our Church, for in one of them it is said,—"After the sacrifice is ended, let all in order receive "our Lord's body . . . . . let the women also, with their heads "veiled, come in order. Let the Bishop give the oblation, saying, The Body of Christ; and let him that receiveth, say "Amen."[4]

Secondly, as to the quotation from Knox's Remains.[5]

Unfortunately Mr. Knox gives not the slightest intimation whence his extract is taken. The only writings of Bishop Overall that have been published are his Convocation Book, and his remarks on the Quinquarticular Controversy. Whence, therefore, Mr. Knox derived the statement on the doctrine of

[1] Ibid. p. 60. [2] See p. 812 above. [3] See p. 39 above.
[4] Ut supra, p. 49. [5] Vol. ii. p. 163. 1st ed.; pp. 181, 182. 2nd ed.

the Eucharist which he attributes to Overall, I am not aware. He tells us, however, that the occasion on which this statement was made was this: that "having, in some public disputation, "so expressed himself respecting the Eucharist, as to excite "jealousy in the minds of his puritanical hearers, he thought "it necessary explicitly to declare what he believed on the "subject." And then he gives the words which are quoted in the Catena.[1] Now I shall not stop to make any remark on the interpretation that might be given to these words, because it has yet to be proved that Overall was the Author, and I have not yet found the least trace of them elsewhere. And I am still less disposed to do so, because, being anxious to ascertain, if possible, what really passed on the occasion alluded to, I instituted a search for any notice of it I could find, and fortunately discovered among the Harleian MSS. at the British Museum what I suppose will be admitted to be the most authentic account of the matter, namely, *one drawn up by Bishop Overall himself*. The matter referred to occurred in the year 1599, when Dr. Overall was complained of to the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, (where he was Regius Professor in divinity,) for having publicly propounded in the schools certain unsound positions. In the MS. to which I refer Dr. Overall gives an account of the proceedings, and in this paper he thus states the matter, so far as our present subject is concerned:—

"They PRETENDED THAT I SHOULD AFFIRM—

"1. That Christ in soul went locally to hell.

"I did not solemnly affirm it, but in these words, Nihil video. . .

* * * * *

"5. The body and blood of Christ is really and substantially present in the Eucharist.

"Thus. In sacramento Eucharistiæ corpus et sanguis Christi, totusque adeo Christus adhibetur digne recipientibus non per modum transubstantiationis, nec per modum consubstantiationis, sed Spiritu Sancto per fidem operante," &c.[2]

Now here we have Bishop Overall's own account of the matter, and he says that he stated his doctrine on the subject "*thus:*"—

"In the sacrament of the Eucharist the body and blood of

[1] Knox's Remains, 2nd ed. vol. ii. p. 181.

[2] Biblioth. Harl. in Mus. Brit. MS. 3142. p. 95, or fol. 48.

Christ, and thus whole Christ, is applied to those who receive WORTHILY, not by the way of transubstantiation, *nor by the way of consubstantiation,* but BY THE HOLY SPIRIT WORKING THROUGH FAITH," &c.

Could I wish for a more satisfactory statement of his doctrine?

I pass on to the quotation from his letter to Grotius.

Thus is it given, and thus was it read in Archdeacon Denison's Defence; with the remark, that the Archdeacon had said nothing so strong as that—a remark which might well be made with regard to the passage, *as read:*—

"There are certain zealots who condemn the practice of our Church in receiving the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ kneeling, or *at least object to His worship and reservation.*"

There is something so extraordinary in the concluding words, —a Bishop of our Church speaking of the worship and even *reservation* of Christ in the sacrament,—that it might have been supposed, that the Archdeacon and his advisers would have hesitated, unless on the clearest evidence, to attribute them to such a man as Bishop Overall, and would have looked to the original Latin in which this letter was written to assure themselves that there was no mistake. And the fact is, that the original Latin is honestly given by the Compiler of the Catena, subjoined to his translation; so that it was under their eye. Now what is this Latin?

"Morem ecclesiæ nostræ sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi de geniculis accipiendi oppugnant, *aut eum saltem colere et custodire recusant.*"[1]

"They oppose our Church's custom of receiving the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ kneeling, *or at least refuse to observe and keep it.*"

Such is the foundation for the reference made to Bishop Overall as sanctioning the Archdeacon's doctrine, that worship is due to the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist under the form of bread and wine, and as favoring even Christ's "reservation" in it!

[1] Epist. Præst. Virorum. ep. 290.

Bishop Morton.

Another witness quoted in the Catena is Bishop Morton,[1] one of the most learned prelates of our Church. And it would be difficult to name any one who has more expressly, fully and learnedly *refuted* the doctrine he is here cited in support of.

The reason for citing the passage quoted appears to be, that in it he says, that "our difference" with the Romanists "is not about the truth or reality of the presence [i. e. of the Body of Christ], but about the true manner of the being and receiving thereof."[2]

But, as we have had abundant evidence, this proves nothing. This is said by Calvin himself, and those who are most opposed to the doctrine in support of which it is quoted in the Catena.

And the fact is, that the quotation is made with the usual good faith that characterizes this Catena. For words are left out in the middle of the passage quoted,[3] in which Calvin is by name referred to as a proof that Protestants admit the presence of Christ's Body, and consequently the "presence" which is admitted is not that which the Authors under review contend for.

A few extracts from *the same Chapter* from which the citation is made will abundantly show Bishop Morton's doctrine. First, then, he expressly maintains, that a body such as that of our Lord himself can only be in one place; and he remarks,—

"From the consideration of the essence of Christ's human body, we come unto the presence thereof in any place, which must be agreeable unto the article of Christian faith; teaching us Christ his residence in heaven until his coming unto judgment, according unto sacred Scriptures, and the Fathers of reverend antiquity, especially S. Augustine; who, for the preservation of the truth of Christ's human nature, *will not admit of the presence of a body in many places at once:* for this is (saith he) 'profanely to destroy the proper nature of a body, because the body which is not circumscribed in one place is no what, because no where.' Many such sentences might be produced, *which cannot be eluded by that only*

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c., Pt. 1. p. 121.

[2] The passage is from his "Catholic Appeal," ed. 1610. lib. ii. ch. 2. § 1. p. 93.

[3] In *this* case it is certainly intimated by dots that *something* is left out, but that does not much mend the matter.

answer of our adversaries, understanding that Christ is not present on earth and in heaven at one time, to wit VISIBLY, *or by a* NATURAL, *but by a* SUPERNATURAL *manner.*" [1]

It will be observed, that in the last words of this passage he notices precisely *and disallows* the sort of presence contended for by the Authors under review.

"Aquinas. . . . from an argument of contradiction did conclusively resolve, that it is absolutely impossible for 'one body to be at the same time locally in many places at once:' whence it must follow (by the judgment of Cardinal Bellarmine) that 'it cannot possibly be sacramentally in diverse places at once.' Where we may note, that as Aquinas, their ancient Bellarmine, hath given us our antecedent, viz., 'no body can possibly be locally in two places at one time,' so Bellarmine, their present Aquinas, hath granted us our consequent, viz., that it must follow upon that 'impossibility,' that there can be no transubstantiation, OR BEING OF CHRIST'S BODILY PRESENCE, *no, not* (*as the Romanists understand it*) *sacramentally*, because of a contradiction." [2]

Again, he contends in the most express terms for the *figurative sense* of the words of institution, which alone settles the whole question:—

"Protestants do teach (as their Cardinal Bellarmine truly witnesseth), that in these words of institution, ('This is my body') the bread is called Christ's body 'figuratively, as being a sign or figure of Christ's body; yet such a figure as doth truly convey unto us the thing signified thereby, for the which truth's sake Christ said not, This bread is a figure of my body, but, It is my body.' Wherein we see two things plainly professed by all Protestants; first, that the words of this sacrament are *not to be expounded according to their literal and proper sense:* secondly, that the matter of this sacrament is the very body and blood of our Lord truly offered and exhibited unto us. Both these, according to our intended manner of evidence, must be briefly and plainly confirmed. First, we prove, that the words *admit not a proper and literal exposition*, but are to be interpreted as Protestants teach, *figuratively*, whether it be by a *metonymy* or by a *synecdoche*. . . . The best rule to interpret Scripture is by the analogy of Scripture, which everywhere speaketh of sacraments sacramentally, *that is, improperly*, calling the sign by the name of the thing which it

[1] Ibid. § 19. p. 113.

[2] Ibid. § 22. p. 118.

signifieth; thus the Lamb sacrificed in memorial of the Angel's passing over the houses of Israel, is called the Passover," &c.

He adds many other instances; and having proved this point, proceeds to point out how Christ is *truly received* in the Eucharist, as follows:—

"More than erroneous is that censure which our adversaries have passed upon Protestant Churches, in regard of their Eucharist; one Jesuit calling it only a 'crust of bread and a pittance of wine:' another traducing their doctrine as though they maintained, with ancient heretics, 'only a figure' of Christ's body: wronging their own consciences, and that (as may be feared) wittingly, seeing they could not be ignorant what Protestants profess, namely, that (as their own Jesuit acknowledgeth) 'although Christ be corporally in heaven, yet is he received of the faithful communicants in this sacrament truly, both spiritually by the mouth of the mind, through a most near conjunction of Christ with the soul of the receiver by faith, and also sacramentally with the bodily mouth, receiving not Christ (meaning, not Christ according to his local presence), but bread and wine, as seals and signs of the promise of redemption in his body and blood.' If therefore, as Pilate once asked, 'What is truth?' it shall be examined what is our *truly* receiving of Christ in this sacrament: we may answer, that therein is a double truth, to wit, *spiritual* or inward, *Christ's body;* and *sacramental*, in the *outward element:* the first *in faith*, the second *in a figure:* yet so that the reality and truth of our receiving doth consist rather in the act of the soul, than in the faculty of any bodily instrument. For this cause Nathaniel, not in respect of his natural offspring, but of the sincerity of his soul, was called a true Israelite," &c. .... "They [the Romanists] place the principal truth of reality in bodily eating of the Eucharist: we comparing the truth of life of this heavenly bread with the truth of a lively eating, which is by faith, do say, *that Judas did eat it sacramentally, but not truly*, according to that truth which is most principal." .... "If 'the living and true bread from heaven' is the very body of Christ incarnate (by the judgment of their Cardinal) 'apprehended by faith,' whereby every true Christian is nourished even without the Eucharist; without the which (as their Jesuit Acosta confesseth) 'the body of Christ may be spiritually eaten for the nourishment of man's soul;' then vain is that vulgar conceit of some, who ask how can a man truly eat the body of Christ spiritually; when as indeed they should rather demand, how shall a man eat the body of Christ

truly (according to that principal truth wherein we are commanded to eat it) except it be spiritually? This truth, of participating of Christ's body, the Fathers taught with one consent, instructing that our tasting of him even in the sacrament 'is not with the corporal palate, but with faith;' our touching him is not with a 'bodily touch, but with faith;' our food therein is 'not for the mouth,' but for 'the mind;' '*our believing is our eating;*' and the body of Christ is food 'not of the outward' but of 'the inward man;' where still we see bodily reality excluded, that the spiritual may be established. And if S. Hierome durst say of the holy Gospel (the audible word of God) that 'it is more truly the body and blood of Christ,' which the 'hearer eateth and drinketh:' 'which is (as saith S. Augustine) the sweetest meat, if a man have his palate, not in the ear, but in the heart;' then may we certainly conclude of the sacrament, which is a visible word, that *the real truth of eating Christ's body therein is, when in receiving the sign and seals thereof we believe that it was crucified for our redemption.*" . . . . "The manner of our real receiving Christ's body is shadowed by a lively resemblance. As when by virtue of a writing and a seal, a man is invested in the right of a kingdom, city, or farm, *so* (saith M. Calvin) *are the faithful truly partakers of the body of Christ, and all the benefits of his passion, although it be in respect of place absent as far as earth from heaven.*" . . . . "We now demand of our adversaries, when a Bishop is invested in his bishopric, by receiving the Pope's Pall, or any man made heir of any portion of land by the gift of a ring, or (if they will) of a rush received from the true and faithful donor thereof, whether these are thereby truly and really interested in those gifts, *although in respect of place they be a thousand miles distant?* or will the parties contemn such precious gifts, because the matter of conveyance is but a rush? So in this sacrament the donor is Christ, the gift is his precious body and blood, the high ransom of man's redemption, conveyed unto mankind by the word and sacrament, *as by a visible deed of gift under the signs and seals of common elements of bread and wine*, consecrated to that use; the right receiver is the penitent and faithful communicant. This similitude *agreeth for the manner*, albeit for the effectualness of the manner we say, that the odds is no less than heaven and earth. For by this faithful participation there is wrought in the godly Christian an ineffable and incomprehensible union and conjunction through faith with the humanity of Christ his Redeemer; whereby he is also made partaker of the Divine nature, by the power whereof he

is sanctified in his body, and shall be immortalized in the resurrection of the just, in that kingdom which our Head Christ doth now bodily possess." [1]

I have purposely taken all these quotations from *the same chapter of the same book* quoted in the *Catena*, that there might be no opening for the charge of self-contradiction. But the reader will find Bishop Morton's judgment on this matter far more fully given in his admirable works on the Eucharist, the titles of which I give below,[2] where he will see all the various points involved in the question copiously and learnedly discussed to *the utter subversion of the whole system of the Authors under review*. It is impossible to find space for further extracts from these works, but I may just observe (as it is a point barely touched upon in the preceding extracts) that he expressly maintains, "that the wicked receivers are called guilty of Christ's body, not by properly eating of his body unworthily, but for unworthily eating the sacrament thereof symbolically," and, "*that the ungodly do not communicate of Christ's body in receiving the Eucharist, is the determinate judgment of antiquity.*" [3]

Bishop Lake.

Another eminent divine of this period, quoted in the *Catena*,[4] is Bishop Lake; and the extract given from his writings is another proof how totally unworthy of confidence this *Catena* is.

As the extract is short, I will give it as it stands.

"What good came to the elements by consecration? Surely much; for they are made the Body and Blood of Christ. So saith Jesus, 'This is my Body,' 'This is my Blood.' The interpretation of these words is much controverted, and it is much disputed what change of the elements the words of Christ did make, for that Christ changed the bread when he consecrated it, we make no doubt. The elements of bread and wine were consecrated that they might be the Body and Blood of Christ. But how are his Body and Blood to be considered? Surely not as Christ is glori-

[1] Ibid. §§ 24—28. pp. 121—131.

[2] Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ. 2nd ed. Lond. 1635. fol. Decisio Controversiæ de Eucharistia. Cant. 1640. 4to.

[3] Of the Institution, &c. bk. v. ch. 2. §§ 4 and 8, pp. 315 and 321.

[4] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. 1. p. 130.

fied, but as he was crucified: for it is that Body that was given (as S. Paul speaketh), was broken, and the blood is that blood which was shed." [1]

Now it is evident on the face of these words, that all depends on the *sort* of change advocated by the author, and in what *sense* the elements are supposed to be made the Body and Blood. And the remark that it is not Christ as *glorified,* but as *crucified,* that is spoken of, will lead any intelligent reader to make a shrewd guess as to the doctrine of the writer.

And the fact is, that between the words "doubt" and "The elements," in this professed extract, *occur two folio pages expressly opposing the doctrine this extract is cited to support.* For thus he writes after the word "doubt,"—

"Whereas then there are three things in bread and wine, 1. the *name*, 2. the *use*, and 3. the *substance;* we confess a change in the two first, but deny it in the third. First, we confess a change in the name, directed by St. Austin's rule; 'Because of a similitude, sacraments commonly bear the names of the things themselves,'" &c. . . . "Secondly, we acknowledge a change in the use of the elements; for there must be some ground for which the signs may bear the names of the things themselves, and that is, *The virtue, the power, the operation of the flesh and blood of Christ,* being mystically united to the signs, do in a wonderful sort manifest these things by the signs through the operation of the Holy Ghost." . . . . "Thus far we go in acknowledging a change of the elements by consecration, FURTHER WE GO NOT."

And then, having proceeded to speak of the sacramental union that exists between the earthly and the heavenly thing, the bread and the body of Christ, in the sacrament, and shown that it does not involve *transubstantiation,* he adds,—

"Whether the sacramental union do require moreover a *consubstantiation,* may also here be disputed; for some urge it out of these words. But their answer is briefly this, The earthly and the heavenly thing may be conjoined *really,* though not *locally.*[2] And

[1] Sermon on Matt. xxvi. 26—28. The work from which this is taken is,—Sermons by the Rt. Rev. Arthur Lake, late Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. Lond. 1629. fol. The passage is at Pt. 2. pp. 167 and 169.

[2] The notion that the bread and the body of Christ are so conjoined as to form one whole, and so that all who receive the one necessarily receive the other, involves of necessity the idea of a *local* conjunction, however the *word* local may be disclaimed.

as they may be conjoined, so they may be received, *seeing the proper Exhibiter of the heavenly is the Holy Spirit and the Receiver is our faith.* [So that it is not given by man, and given into our hands with the bread to be taken into our mouth with the bread.] *Our faith may ascend to Christ in heaven, and the Spirit being infinite may unite us unto Christ, though we be as low as the earth.* . . . . . We confess then that in the sacrament there is the body and blood of Christ, and that three manner of ways; *though we admit neither of the two false ways, Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation.* First, in regard of the *sign;* for it was not chosen for itself, but with reference to Christ. Secondly, in regard of the *resemblance;* it doth most fitly set forth the efficacy that is in Christ, the strengthening, the cheering efficacy. . . . . A third reason why we hold the sacrament to be the body and blood of Christ is, because the heavenly thing is conveyed unto us by the earthly; 'the bread which we break,' &c. In a word, the sacramental union made by consecration serveth to make the sacrament fit for our participation; 'twas so, it is so, in every sacrament of the Old, of the New Testament."

And then, after a few further remarks, he adds what forms the remainder of the extract in the *Catena;* the meaning of which is thus clear.

And he goes on to make the following among other similar observations:—

"And this will not only secure our souls, but settle our judgments against the sophistry of the Church of Rome, who *not distinguishing between Christ crucified and glorified,* or rather not building their conclusions answerable to this undeniable principle, *The sacraments represent Christ crucified, not glorified,* are driven to coin so many new Articles, 1. *of real presence corporal,* 2. of a metaphysical transubstantiation, 3. of an ill-applied concomitancy. All which easily vanish, if we consider Christ's purpose to represent himself in the sacrament, not as he now is at the right hand of God, but as he was upon the cross. Not but it is the same body and blood which is in glory, but it must not be so considered as it is in glory. Which will necessarily enforce us to acknowledge, that the union between the thing earthly and heavenly can be no more than sacramental, and that respective also to what was done on earth, not what is in heaven; was, I say, done *formaliter* on the cross, but is *effective* working in heaven. For that body which Christ sacrificed for us, he presents in heaven to propitiate God towards us, not continuing the act of sacrificing," &c.[1]

[1] p. 170.

"Besides this work of taking, the disciples had another work, and that is 'eating and drinking;' what they take, that they must 'eat and drink' also. These are corporal acts, but *they must be understood according to the food.* And seeing the food consisteth of an earthly and a heavenly part, we must eat and drink both. And God hath provided us wherewith we may do it; for we ourselves consist of an earthly and a heavenly part. We must bring both parts unto this feast, and there use them both; *our bodies must 'take eat and drink' the elements; our souls must 'take eat and drink' the body and blood of Christ.* [No such union is advocated here, as that to receive the one is to receive the other. The reception of the body of Christ is described as *an act of the soul.*] Yea, our bodies must in these acts only attend our souls; for the feast is not *ventris* but *mentis;* neither is our corporal feeding used otherwise than to help forward our spiritual. Secondly, our eating and drinking must not only feed upon Christ's body and blood, but upon them, as the one was *broken*, and the other was *shed*, as they were the propitiatory sacrifice. And then, thirdly, we must draw out of them and digest in our souls the two comfortable ends of the sacrament, that is, first, our assurance that we are in the New Covenant; secondly, that our sins are pardoned. If we do not take all these things in our eating and drinking, we do not take all that which is set before us and offered unto us." [1]

The doctrine inculcated in all this is too manifest to need any remark.

Nevertheless in this very sermon we have an instance of the use of that dangerous language which we shall find occurring in some of our subsequent divines, and in works where, from the absence of any direct dogmatic statements on the doctrine of the Eucharist, we cannot *prove* the sense in which the phrases were used. For in the prayer at the end of the sermon, Bishop Lake uses these words,—

"Grant that we never neglect to receive, and when we receive may ever be prepared, prepared both in body and soul, so here by faith worthily to feed on thee *as thou representest thyself veiled in thy Church Militant*, that we may hereafter fully enjoy thee, as thou presentest thyself unveiled in the Church Triumphant." [2]

Now the meaning of these words, when taken in connexion with the rest of the sermon, is clear. The Bishop had no notion of there being a real presence of Christ's body and

[1] p. 173. [2] p. 176.

blood veiled under the bread and wine, because he expressly disclaims it; but meant only, that *faith viewed him* as present under these symbols, and as by their instrumentality brought into communion with the believer. But the words, standing alone, might seem to favor the doctrine of the Real Presence in or under the forms of the bread and wine. We must, therefore, bear this in mind when we meet with similar expressions in other divines of our Church. They are terms which, though open to an unorthodox interpretation, would readily present themselves to the mind of one writing on the subject, in a sense quite consistent with the doctrine here advocated; especially when there was no danger of any one in our own communion misinterpreting them.

Dean Field.

In the quotations given in the *Catena* from Dean Field[1] there is nothing to which, rightly understood, and in the sense which other parts of his work show that *he himself* affixed to the words, I can see any objection. "That Christ's body and blood are truly present in the sacrament, and that they are given to be the food of our souls, and that the outward elements are changed to become the Body and Blood of Christ;"[2] and "that that which before was earthly and common bread, by the words of institution, the invocation of God's name and Divine virtue, is made a sacrament of the true Body and Blood of Christ visibly sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, and yet after an invisible and incomprehensible manner present in the Church;"[3] I deny not any more than Dean Field, if the words are rightly understood, suitably to the subject of which they speak. By consecration the elements are changed in character and use, so as to become symbolically and in effect the body and blood of Christ; and that body and blood are truly present in the sacramental rite to every devout communicant, yea, brought into communion with him by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

And that Dean Field did not understand them in the sense

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence. Pt. i. p. 126, and Pt. ii. pp. 16, 17. The passages are taken from his treatise "Of the Church," app. to bk. v. 2nd ed. 1628. fol. pp. 770 and 771.

[2] Pt. i. p. 126.

[3] Pt. ii. pp. 16, 17.

in which Archdeacon Denison would interpret them, is evident from his soon after referring to what he calls the "most godly and learned discourse touching this point" of *Zanchius*. And further, he expressly says,—

"A bodily eating of Christ's body there cannot be, seeing it is impossible. . . . . so that *there is only a spiritual eating of Christ, consisting in that chewing that is by meditation upon the several and distinct things that are found in his natures, powers, actions and sufferings; a trajection from the understanding part to the heart, and an incorporation of the believer into him.*" [1]

Will the Archdeacon give his assent to this statement? If not, and if the statement involves, as it clearly does, a totally different doctrine from that of the Archdeacon, how can Dean Field be fairly quoted in the Archdeacon's favor on account of certain phrases used by him in a sense which the Archdeacon would reject?

But again, Dean Field clearly repudiates the very doctrine as to the wicked eating the body of Christ, which the Archdeacon makes the corner-stone of his system. For the Dean, wishing as far as possible to narrow the difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed Churches, in order to meet the objections of the Romanists as to the division of Protestants among themselves, and hence making the doctrine of the two parties appear as similar as he was able,[2] nevertheless feels himself compelled to take the following exception to the doctrine of Luther and his followers:—

"Yet *it is not to be denied*, but that Luther and some other did teach, that *even the wicked do in a sort eat the flesh of Christ*, not as if they did corporally touch his sacred body, much less tear, rend, or divide it with their teeth, or turn it into their substance; but for that they may be said, in a sort, to eat the flesh of Christ, *though unprofitably*, and to their condemnation, *in that they truly receive*

[1] Of the Church, Bk. v. App. ed. 1628. p. 822.

[2] With this purpose in view he has been led, I think, to represent the doctrine of the Lutherans as somewhat different from the reality; for he seems to wish us to suppose, that their doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body merely means, that, as the Godhead is omnipresent and the human nature of Christ is hypostatically joined to the Godhead in the Person of Christ, therefore the body of Christ may be said to be, in a sense, everywhere present, on account of its personal union with that which is omnipresent. But the Lutheran doctrine goes far beyond this, for this all would admit.

the body of Christ; eating that outward substance of bread, with which it is truly present, though not locally: and to this purpose the same Zanchius reporteth, that a man of no vulgar note amongst the followers of Luther did not fear to tell him, that he and his do not say that we eat the body of Christ corporally in such sort as that our mouth and body should touch his sacred body, which is not locally present, but that the body of Christ is eaten bodily only in respect of the sacramental union, attributing that to the body of Christ that properly agreeth to the bread, with which the body is present." [1]

Here he clearly intimates his *dissent* from the notion that "the wicked do, in a sort, eat the flesh of Christ," "though unprofitably," and therefore his testimony is beyond question adverse to the Archdeacon's views.

Thus far, then, we find the testimony of our divines altogether opposed to the doctrine of the Authors under review, and we have now considered the statements of all those Authors that have been quoted in its favor, who flourished[2] previously to the year 1609. For the first fifty years after the Reformation was finally established among us on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, we find no witness in favor of that doctrine. On the contrary, all condemn it. The attempt to show that there are such witnesses, turns out to be utterly abortive, and to rest on representations of which the least that can be said is, that they show a very culpable disregard to accuracy of statement.

SECTION IV.

Testimony of subsequent Divines.

I proceed to consider the statements of the other divines of our Church that have been adduced as witnesses for the doctrine here controverted. And I shall take first *seriatim* those that were referred to in the defence of Archdeacon Denison,—both those that were taken from the *Catena*, and those added to it,—beginning with,—

[1] Ibid. pp. 822, 823.

[2] I mean by this word, those who obtained any superior office in our Church previous to the year 1609.

The reader who has perused the former part of this work, is already sufficiently in possession of the doctrine advocated by Bishop Taylor to know how to estimate this reference to him. The extracts already made from his writings,[1]—taken from a work expressly written on the subject,[2] and the most important of those referred to in the *Catena*,—might amply suffice to answer the claim thus made. In these extracts we have seen how he ridicules the idea of a body being present in the form of a spirit, or existing, in any form, in more than one place. He says, "Can a body remaining a body be at the same time a spirit?"[3] "When we speak of a *body*, all the world means that which hath a finite quantity, and is determined to *one place*."[4] And the notion of an indescribable presence of the substance of the body, to be called *sacramental*, he laughs at, observing,—"But now a fourth word "must be invented, and that is *sacramentaliter*. Christ's body is "sacramentally in more places than one: which is very true, "*that is, the sacrament of Christ's body is:* and so is his Body, *figu-* "*ratively, tropically, representatively* in being, and *really in effect* "*and blessing*."[5] And adds on this "device" of imagining a presence "not local but sacramental,"—"I wish the words were "sense, and that I could tell the meaning of being in a place "locally and not locally, unless a thing can be in a place, and not "in a place, that is, so to be *in*, that it is also out: but so long "as it is a distinction it is no matter, it will amuse and make way "to *escape*, if it will do nothing else."[6]

So again he interprets St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. x. 16.—"This bread is the communication of Christ's body, that is, the "exhibition and donation of it; *not Christ's body formally, but* "*virtually and effectively*, it makes us communicate with Christ's

[1] See pp. 50, 51; 88; 97—99; 132; 163; 169—172; 179, 180; 184; 208, 209; 210; 212, 213; 395 above.

[2] "The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation," first published in 1654. small 8vo.

[3] See p. 50 above; or Taylor's Real Presence, &c. ed. 1654. p. 213.

[4] See p. 163 above; or, Taylor's Real Presence, &c. p. 212.

[5] See p. 169 above; or, ibid. p. 215.

[6] See p. 170 above, and the other quotations in pp. 170—172; or ibid. pp. 222 et seq.

body in all the effects and benefits."[1] He expressly maintains also the *figurative sense* of the words of institution. "The bread is Christ's body in a *figurative improper* sense." "It is *figuratively*, not properly and naturally, spoken of bread, that it is the flesh or body of our Lord." "There are very many inducements to infer the figurative or tropical interpretation."[2] And the argument of Bellarmine that Christ's words, that he that eateth his flesh shall live for ever, mean, he that eateth *worthily*, (which is precisely that of Archdeacon Denison) he refutes at length, maintaining that "THIS EATING CANNOT BE A THING WHICH CAN POSSIBLY BE DONE UNWORTHILY."[3]

His definition of the nature of the Real Presence as held by our Church,[4] I must here repeat:—

"Christ is present spiritually, *that is, by effect and blessing.*"[5]

"In the sacrament is given us the true substance of Christ's body or flesh, but not carnally, but spiritually; that is, *not to our mouths, but to our hearts;* not to be chewed by teeth, but to be *eaten by faith.*"[6]

"It is remarkable that Bellarmine, when he is stating this question (De Euch. lib. i. c. 2. reg. 3.) seems to say the same thing, for which he quotes the words of S. Bernard now mentioned; for he says, that Christ's body is there *truly, substantially, really*, but *not corporally;* nay, you may say, *spiritually.* AND NOW A MAN WOULD THINK WE HAD HIM SURE; BUT HIS NATURE IS LABILE AND SLIPPERY; YOU ARE NEVER THE NEARER FOR THIS..... For he intends not, for all these fine words, that Christ's body is present spiritually, as the word is used in Scripture, and in all common notices of usual speaking; but *spiritually with him signifies after the manner of spirits*, which, besides that it is a cousening the world in the manner of expression, is also *a direct folly and contradiction*, that a body should be substantially present, that is, with the nature of a body naturally, and yet be not as a body but as a spirit, with that manner of being with which a spirit is distinguished from a body. In vain therefore it is that he denies the carnal

[1] See p. 88 above; or, ibid. pp. 92, 93.

[2] See pp. 208, 209 above; or, ibid. pp. 105—109.

[3] See pp. 97—99 above; or, ibid. pp. 42—49.

[4] Quoted pp. 212, 213 above.

[5] Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, &c. ed. 1654. p. 5.

[6] Ibid. p. 13.

manner, and admits a spiritual, and ever after requires that we believe a carnal presence, even in the very manner. But this caution and exactness in the use of the word 'spiritual' is therefore carefully to be observed, lest the contention of both parties should seem trifling, and to be for nothing. We say that Christ's body is in the Sacrament *really*, but *spiritually*. They say it is there *really*, but *spiritually*. For so Bellarmine is bold to say, that the word may be allowed in this question. Where, now, is the difference? Here by 'spiritually' they mean, *present after the manner of a spirit;* by 'spiritually' WE MEAN, PRESENT TO OUR SPIRITS ONLY; that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith, or spiritual susception; but their way *makes his body to be present no way but that which is impossible and implies a contradiction; a body not after the manner of a body, a body like a spirit;* a body without a body; and a sacrifice of body and blood without blood: *corpus incorporeum, cruor incruentus.* They say that Christ's body is truly present there as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after that manner of being as an angel is in a place. That's their *spiritually*. But we by the *real spiritual presence* of Christ do understand, CHRIST TO BE PRESENT AS THE SPIRIT OF GOD IS PRESENT IN THE HEARTS OF THE FAITHFUL BY BLESSING AND GRACE; AND THIS IS ALL WHICH WE MEAN BESIDES THE TROPICAL AND FIGURATIVE PRESENCE."[1]

Such are some of the statements,—a mere specimen out of a host of similar passages,—of one of the works referred to on the opposite side as proving that Bishop Taylor held the same doctrine as that of Archdeacon Denison, and from which a few extracts, suitable for the purpose, are given in the *Catena*.[2] And this work is one in which Bishop Taylor has, *ex professo*, given his doctrine on the question before us.

I had intended to add a copious selection of extracts from this work, but my space compels me to give but a few.

"In the explication of this question it is much insisted upon, that it be inquired, whether when we say we believe Christ's body to be *really* in the sacrament, we mean, that body, that flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, dead, and buried? I answer, I know none else that he had or hath. . . . and therefore

[1] Ibid. pp. 13—15.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 87—90.

when any of the Protestant divines or any of the Fathers deny that body which was born of the Virgin Mary, that which was crucified, to be eaten in the sacrament, as Bertram, as S. Hierom, as Clemens Alexandrinus expressly affirm, the meaning is easy, they intend that it is not eaten in a natural sense; and then calling it *corpus spirituale*, the word *spiritual* IS NOT A SUBSTANTIAL PREDICATION, BUT IS AN AFFIRMATION OF THE MANNER, though in disputation it be made the predicate of a proposition, and the opposite member of a distinction." [1]

"So that now the question is not, Whether the symbols be changed into Christ's body and blood, or no. For it is granted on all sides. But, Whether this conversion be *sacramental* and FIGURATIVE, or whether it be *natural* and *bodily*. Nor is it, Whether Christ be really taken, but, Whether he be taken in a spiritual or in a natural manner. *We say the conversion is* FIGURATIVE, *mysterious and sacramental;* they say, it is proper, natural and corporal: *we affirm that Christ is really taken* BY FAITH, BY THE SPIRIT, TO ALL REAL EFFECTS OF HIS PASSION; they say, he is taken by the mouth, and that *the spiritual and the virtual taking him in virtue or effect* is not sufficient, though done also in the sacrament." [2]

That the words "This is my body," are to be understood figuratively, he thus maintains:—

"The sum of all is this; If of bread Christ said, This is my body, because it cannot be true in a proper natural sense, it implying a contradiction that it should be properly bread, and properly Christ's body, it must follow, That it is Christ's body *in a figurative improper sense.*" [3]

"Since therefore (as I have proved) the bread remains, and of bread it was affirmed, 'This is my body,' it follows inevitably that it is *figuratively not properly and naturally spoken of bread*, That it is the flesh or body of our Lord." [4]

"The next words to be considered are, 'est corpus,' 'This is my body;' and here begins the first *tropical expression*, '*est*,' that is, *significat* or *repræsentat, et exhibit corpus meum*, say some. 'This

[1] BISHOP J. TAYLOR, Real Presence, &c. ed. 1654, pp. 18, 19. This passage is actually quoted in the Catena itself, on account, I suppose, of the misunderstood ambiguous words at the commencement; though the words at the close subvert the foundation of the doctrine of the Authors under review, making *spiritual* refer not to the nature of the body communicated, but to the manner in which it is communicated.

[2] Ibid. p. 21. Here Archdeacon Denison might object to some of the words attributed to the Romanists, but *the question is, Does he assent to Bishop Taylor's statements?*

[3] p. 105. [4] p. 106.

is my body;' it is to all real effects the same to your particulars which my body is to all the Church: it signifies the breaking of my body, the effusion of my blood for you, and applies my passion to you, and conveys to you all the benefits; as this nourishes your bodies, so my body nourishes your souls to life eternal, and consigns your bodies to immortality. Others make the trope in *corpus*, so that *est* shall signify properly, but *corpus* is taken in a spiritual sense, sacramental and mysterious; not a natural and præsential. *Whether the figure be in 'est' or in 'corpus,' is but a question of rhetoric, and of no effect. That the proposition is tropical and figurative is the thing;* and that Christ's natural body is now in heaven definitively, and nowhere else; and that he is in the sacrament as he can be in a sacrament; in the hearts of faithful receivers, as he hath promised to be there; that is, in the sacrament mystically, operatively, as in a moral and divine instrument, in the hearts of receivers by faith and blessing; this is the truth and the faith of which we are to give a reason and account to them that disagree." . . . . "IT SIGNIFIES THE BODY FIGURATIVELY, OR THE EFFECTS AND REAL BENEFITS." [1]

"Christ's body is eaten only *sacramentally* by the *body*, but *really* and *effectively* only by *faith*, which is the mouth of the soul." [2]

To the argument that "the literal sense is to be presumed, unless the contrary be proved," he replies,—"which is very true; but I have evidently proved the contrary concerning the words of Institution." [3]

But "we do not say that in the sacrament we only receive the sign and figure of Christ's body; but all the real *effects and benefits of it*." [4]

And to the argument from 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29, he replies,—

"It is the body of the Lord in the same sense here as in the words of Institution, *which I have evinced to be exegetical, sacramental and spiritual;* and by despising the sacrament of it we become guilty of the body and blood of Christ. . . . . If you abuse the King's image, the affront relates to your Prince. . . . . The evil communicant is 'guilty of the body and blood of Christ' just as relapsing Christians are said by the same Apostles 'to crucify the Lord of life again, and put him to an open shame,' which I suppose they cannot do naturally or corporally. One is as the other, that is, both are *tropical or figurative*." [5]

"In Scripture it is as plainly affirmed to be bread as it is called

[1] pp. 106—109. [2] p. 140. [3] p. 142. [4] p. 142. [5] pp. 143—145.

Christ's body. Now then because it cannot be both in the proper and natural sense, but one of them must be *figurative and tropical*, since both of the appellatives are equally affirmed, is it not notorious that in this case we ought to give judgment on that side which we are prompted to by common sense? If Christ had said only, This is my body, and no Apostle had told us also that it is bread, we had reason to suspect our senses to be deceived, if it were possible they should be: but when it is equally affirmed to be bread, as to be our Lord's body, and but one of them can be naturally true and in the letter, shall the testimony of all our senses be absolutely of no use in casting the balance? The two affirmatives are equal; one must be expounded *tropically;* which will you choose? Is there in the world anything more certain and expedite than that what you see and feel and taste natural and proper should be judged to be that which you see and feel and taste naturally and properly, and *therefore that the other be expounded tropically?* Since you *must expound one of the words tropically*, I think it is not hard to determine whether you ought to do it against your sense or with it." [1]

And on the very point which Archdeacon Denison makes the *test* of any one holding his doctrine, namely, the reception of Christ's body by the wicked, he thus *expressly* denies it:—

"*The wicked receive not Christ, but* THE BARE SYMBOLS ONLY; but yet to their hurt, because the offer of Christ is rejected, and they pollute the blood of the Covenant by using it as an unholy thing." [2]

And he objects to the Church of Rome, that, in opposition to the doctrine of the Church of England, it asserts, "That the flesh of Christ is eaten by every communicant, good and bad, worthy and unworthy." [3]

"By the doctrine of the ancient Church *wicked men do not eat the body, nor drink the blood of Christ.*" And he proceeds to prove this by many passages from the writings of the Fathers. (pp. 132 et seq.) *And particularly from the passage in St. Augustine, quoted in the XXIXth Article,* remarking that "he calls that which the wicked eat nothing but *signum corporis et sanguinis* . . . . all the wicked DO BUT EAT *the sign of Christ's body*" [4]

"As Christ is eaten by faith out of the sacrament, so is he also

[1] pp. 173, 174. [2] p. 7. [3] p. 20. [4] p. 136.

in the sacrament; as he is real and spiritual meat to the worthy hearer, so is he to the worthy communicant; as Christ's flesh is life to all that obey him, so to all that obediently remember him."[1]

"There is no eating of Christ's flesh or drinking his blood but by a moral instrument, faith and subordination to Christ; the sacramental external eating alone being no eating of Christ's flesh, but the symbols and sacrament of it."[2]

He expressly maintains also,[3] that Christ's body is only eaten by us in the same sense and way in which it was eaten by the Fathers of the Old Testament, when the substance of his body did not exist.

The arguments used by the Authors under review to prove the possibility of their doctrine from Christ coming out of the grave before the stone was rolled away &c. (as above referred to[4]), all taken from the Romish armoury, are disposed of as utterly groundless.[5]

And speaking of the testimony of the Fathers, he says,—

"All those testimonies of Fathers which are as general, indefinite and unexpounded as the words of Scripture which are in question, must in this question pass for nothing; and therefore when the Fathers say, that in the sacrament is 'the body and blood of Christ,' that 'there is the body of our Lord,' that before consecration it is ἄρτος ἁπλοῦς, *mere bread*, but after consecration it is *verily the body of Christ, truly his flesh, truly his blood*, these and the like sayings are no more than the words of Christ, 'This is my body,' *and are only true in the same sense of which I have all this while been giving an account; that is, by a change of condition, of sanctification, and usage.* We believe that after consecration and blessing, it is really Christ's body, which is verily and indeed taken of the faithful in the Lord's Supper. And upon this account we shall find that many, very many of the authorities of the Fathers commonly alleged by the Roman doctors in this question will come to nothing. For we speak their sense, and in their own words, the Church of England (see Art. 28) expressing this mystery frequently in the same forms of words; and we are so certain that to eat Christ's body *spiritually* is to eat him *really*, that there is *no other way* for him to be eaten *really* than by *spiritual manducation*."[6]

And speaking of the Fathers maintaining a change of the symbols in the sacrament, he says that a conversion of one kind

[1] p. 60. [2] p. 62. [3] pp. 130, 131.
[4] See pp. 147—153 above. [5] pp. 246—249. [6] pp. 255, 256.

" is not denied, meaning by it *a change of use, of condition, of* " *sanctification;* as a table is changed into an altar; a house " into a church; a man into a priest," &c.[1]

"That the words of the Fathers in their most hyperbolical expressions ought to be expounded *sacramentally* and *mystically*, we have sufficient warrant from themselves, affirming frequently that *the name of the thing signified is given to the sign.* . . . Now upon this declaration of themselves, and of Scripture, whatsoever attributes either of them give to bread after consecration, we are, by themselves, warranted against the force of the words by a metaphorical sense; for if they call the sign by the name of the thing signified, and *the thing intended* is called by the name of *a figure*, and the *figure* by the name of the *thing*, then *no affirmation of the Fathers can conclude against them that have reason to believe* THE SENSE OF THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION TO BE FIGURATIVE; for their answer is ready; the Fathers, and the Scriptures too, call the figure by the name of the thing figurated; the bread by the name of flesh, or the body of Christ, *which it figures and represents.*" [2]

" Whatsoever the Fathers speak of this they affirm the same " also of the other sacrament, and of the sacramentals or rituals " of the Church." And he proceeds to point out various instances of this, as that they that hear the word of Christ eat the flesh of Christ,—that the nature of the water in Baptism is changed by the blessing,—that in baptism we are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ.[3]

And having adduced various considerations of this kind respecting the testimony of the Fathers, he proceeds to cite numerous passages from them in support of the doctrine he maintains.

From the above extracts, therefore, we may understand what he means, when, in the same Treatise, he thus describes the doctrine of the Church of England:—

"The doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the Protestants in this article, is: That after the Minister of the holy mysteries hath *ritely* prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and the wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ after a *sacramental*, that is, in a *spiritual real manner;* so that all that WORTHILY communicate do *by faith* receive *Christ really, effectually*, to all the purposes of his passion. THE WICKED RECEIVE

[1] p. 270. [2] pp. 273, 274. [3] pp. 276, 277.

NOT CHRIST, BUT THE BARE SYMBOLS ONLY; but yet to their hurt, because the offer of Christ is rejected, and they pollute the blood of the Covenant, by using it as an unholy thing. The result of which doctrine is this: It is bread, and it is Christ's body. It is bread in *substance*, Christ in the *sacrament;* and Christ is *as really* given to all that are *truly disposed*, as the symbols are; *each as they can;* Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can; and to the same real purposes to which they are designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul, as the elements do the body. It is here as in the other sacrament; for, as there, natural water becomes the laver of regeneration, so, here, bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ, but there and here too, the first substance is changed by grace, but remains the same in nature."[1]

And hence we may understand what he means in a passage given in the *Catena*[2] from another work, namely,—

"We say, as they said, Christ's body is truly there, and there is a conversion of the elements into Christ's body; for what, before the consecration, in all senses was bread, is, after consecration, *in some sense*, Christ's body."

Of course it is, "*in some sense*," Christ's Body, as no one denies; but the quotation of such a passage for the purpose for which it is quoted is—what one is unwilling to call it.

From these passages, then, the doctrine of Bishop Taylor is clear, and it is needless to examine each particular expression that may occur in his other works, still less to add to these testimonies,[3] for in this work we have his *formal and express judgment* on the points in question. And by his statements in this work we must judge of his meaning in other places; as, for instance, in the incidental expressions quoted from one of his practical works, and so much insisted on in defence of Archdeacon Denison's doctrine that the wicked eat the body of Christ, where he says,—"If thou "dost communicate unworthily, thou *eatest and drinkest Christ to* "*thy danger and death and destruction;*" and "he that *receiveth* "*Christ into an impure soul or body*, first turns his most excel-

[1] pp. 7, 8.

[2] Pt. i. p. 97. The passage is from his Discourse of Transubstantiation in his Dissuasive from Popery.

[3] Others might be found in his "Worthy Communicant," ch. i. § 2; and a decisive one on the question of *adoration* will be found under "Archbishop Wake" below.

"lent nourishment into poison and then feeds upon it."[1] In the face of his formal and deliberate recorded judgment that "*the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbols only,*" it would be worse than absurd to construe these expressions in their most strict literal sense. In fact, who are the theologians who hold that the wicked really receive Christ into their souls? Interpreting these expressions by the light of his own dogmatic decision, that the wicked do not eat Christ, but the bare symbols only, we are necessitated to understand them as equivalent only to the statement, that they who receive the sacramental body of Christ into themselves while their souls are impure, eat and drink what brings to them death and destruction through their awful profanation of holy things.

And by his use of these expressions in this way, we may see how little we can depend upon inferences derived from incidental phrases in practical works, to give us the real doctrine of an Author on such points.

Bishop Cosin.

Another of our divines quoted in the *Catena*,[2] and urged with confidence in the defence of Archdeacon Denison as a witness in his favor, is Bishop Cosin, in his History of Transubstantiation. From this witness, and from *the very same work* thus referred to, various extracts have been given in the former part of this work,[3] from which the reader is probably already able to judge how far his doctrine is that of Archdeacon Denison.

We have there heard him saying,—

"Certain it is, that the bread is not the body of Christ *any otherwise than as the cup is the New Testament;* and two different consequences cannot be drawn from those two not different expressions. Therefore, as the cup cannot be the New Testament but *by a sacramental figure*, no more can the bread be the body of Christ but *in the same sense.*"[4]

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence as set forth, &c. Pt. i. pp. 92, 93. They are taken from his "Holy Living," &c. sect. x.

[2] Doctr. of Real Pres. &c Pt. i. pp. 97—99.

[3] See pp. 165; 197; 209; 210; 249, 250; 416, 417 above.

[4] See p. 209 above. Hist. of Transubst. ed. 1840. p. 78.

"Because ordinary bread is changed by consecration into a bread which is no more *of common use*, but appointed by Divine institution to be a *sacramental sign* whereby is represented the body of Christ, in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and being thereby dignified, having great excellences superadded, and so made what it was not before, it is therefore said by some of the Fathers to be changed, to be made another thing . . . . but it is a change of *state and condition*," &c.[1]

"The Fathers" "understood *no other change* than that which is common to all sacraments, whereby the outward natural part is said to be changed into the inward and divine, *only because it represents it truly and efficaciously*, and makes all WORTHY RECEIVERS partakers thereof; and because by the virtue of the Holy Spirit, and of Christ's holy institution, the elements obtain those Divine excellences and prerogatives, which they cannot have of their own nature. And this is it which was taught and believed for above a thousand years together by pious and learned antiquity concerning this most holy mystery."[2]

With respect to the extracts given in the *Catena*, and urged in defence of Archdeacon Denison, all depends, as usual, on the sense in which the phrases there used are understood; and of course they are to be interpreted in consistency with the constant statements of the work from which they are taken. In a subject where a number of phrases are used in different significations it is impossible to know the meaning of an author but by viewing his work as a whole. And as the testimony of Bishop Cosin is so highly estimated, I shall add some more extracts from this work.

That the body and blood of Christ are not received by those devoid of faith, he thus expressly maintains:—

"True it is, that to the faithful the element becomes a vivifying body, because they are truly partakers of the heavenly bread, the body of Christ: but to others, who either receive not, or are not believers, *to them the bread may be the antitype, but is not, neither doth become the body of Christ; for* WITHOUT FAITH CHRIST IS NEVER EATEN, as is gathered from the same father, [Basil]."[3]

"The body of Christ is given in the Eucharist, but TO THE FAITH-

[1] See p. 416 above. Hist. of Trans. ch. vi. § 7. ed. 1840. p. 143.
[2] See p. 417 above. Hist. &c. ch. vi. 1. p. 136.
[3] Hist. of Transubst. ed. 1840. pp. 93, 94.

FUL ONLY, and that by means of the sacrament of the consecrated bread." [1]

"That Christ (as the Papists affirm) should give his flesh and blood to be *received with the mouth* and ground with the teeth, so that not only the most wicked and infidels, but even rats and mice should swallow him down, this our words and our hearts do utterly deny." [2]

And when he says that Protestants hold, that there is "a conversion of the bread into the body (and consequently of the wine into the blood) of Christ," he immediately explains what he means by this in the following words,—"For they know "and acknowledge, that in the sacrament, by virtue of the words "and blessing of Christ, *the condition, use, and office* of the bread "is wholly changed; that is, of common and ordinary, it be-"comes our mystical and sacramental food; whereby, as they "affirm and believe, the true body of Christ is not only sha-"dowed and figured, but also given in deed, and by WORTHY "communicants truly received." And he adds that this change is "ONLY *a mysterious and sacramental one*, whereby our ordi-"nary is changed into *mystic bread*, and thereby designed and "appointed to another *use, end, and office*, than before." [3]

And he explains the connexion between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ to be this, that to *the faithful communicant* the latter are given *together with* the former:—

"The words of institution would plainly make it appear to any man that would prefer truth to wrangling, that it is *with the bread* that the Lord's body is *given*, as His blood with the wine: for Christ, having taken, blessed, and broken the bread, said, 'This is my body;' and St. Paul, than whom none could better understand the meaning of Christ, explains it thus: 'The bread which we break is the κοινωνία, communion or communication of the body of Christ,' that whereby his body is given and *the faithful* are made partakers of it." [4]

"The result of all this is, that the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally united to the bread and wine, so that Christ is truly given to *the faithful*. . . . . It is said that the body and blood of Christ are joined to the bread and wine, because that *in the celebra-*

[1] Ib. p. 116. [2] Ib. p. 62. [3] Ib. pp. 56, 57. [4] Ib. pp. 77, 78.

tion of the holy Eucharist the flesh is *given together with* the bread, and the blood *together with* the wine."[1]

By these passages, therefore, we see his meaning when he says, that "by divine appointment these two [the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ] are made one."[2] Indeed in the context he tells us, that he does not mean a "natural, substantial, personal or local" union, but only that "*in eating* the blessed bread, the true body of Christ is *given* to us," that is, as he says elsewhere, is *given by God to* THE FAITHFUL; and he adds in further explanation, that they are "united *in time*, though NOT IN PLACE;" and therefore they are *not* considered by him as *united in the priest's hands*.

Again he says,—

"Because the thing signified is offered and given to us as truly as the sign itself, *in this respect* we own the union betwixt the body and blood of Christ and the elements, whose *use and office* we hold to be changed from what it was before. But we deny .... that the elements still retain the nature of sacraments when not used according to divine institution, that is, given by Christ's ministers, and received by his people; so that Christ in the consecrated bread ought not, *cannot* be kept and preserved to be carried about, because HE IS PRESENT ONLY TO THE COMMUNICANTS."[3]

"The nature of this mystery is such, that when we receive the bread and wine, we also, *together with them*, receive at the same time the body and blood of Christ, which in the celebration of the holy Eucharist are as truly given as they are represented. Hence came into the Church this manner of speaking,—the consecrated bread is Christ's body."[4]

These passages show the vast difference between that union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine maintained by Bishop Cosin, and that asserted by Archdeacon Denison. The former is only a presence to the faithful communicant in the reception of the bread and wine. The latter is a presence to the bread and wine, such that all who eat them do, in that act of eating them, eat the body and blood of Christ. And *the practical consequences* resulting from this difference of view are most serious.

[1] Ib. p. 55. [2] p. 59. [3] Ib. pp. 60, 61. [4] Ib. p. 141.

He points out also that it is not a body in the form of a spirit that is eaten in the sacrament :—

"[Christ] did not say, that He gave His disciples a fantastic body—such a visionary figment as Marcion believed—but *that very body which was given for us, without being deprived of that extension and other accidents of human bodies without which it could not have been crucified.* Since the maintainers of transubstantiation grant, that the body of Christ keeps its quantity in heaven, and say it is *without the same in the sacrament*, [as certain others also do,] they must either acknowledge their contradiction in the matter, or give over their opinion."[1]

The body of Christ, according to Bishop Cosin, is not eaten with the mouth but with the spirit; for he tells us that Berengarius "taught that the body of Christ was not eaten with the mouth, in a carnal way, but *with the mind and soul and spirit*," which he proceeds to call the "*orthodox and ancient doctrine.*"[2]

And he quotes with approbation the following passage from the Confession of one of the Continental Reformed Churches :—

"Christ is not absent from His Church celebrating his holy Supper. The sun in heaven, being distant from us, is nevertheless present by his efficacy; how much more shall Christ, the Sun of righteousness, who is *bodily in heaven, absent from us*, be *spiritually present* to us *by His life-giving virtue*, and as He declared in His last Supper He would be present (John xiv. xv. xvi.); whence it follows that we have no communion without Christ."[3]

These extracts are, I suppose, amply sufficient to settle the question as to the doctrine of Bishop Cosin. But there is one passage in his Notes on the Book of Common Prayer which it may be well to add.

On the rubric requiring the posture of *kneeling* at the reception of the sacramental elements, the Bishop writes thus :—

"True it is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present, when the blessed bread and wine *are taken* by the faithful communicants; and as true it is also, that they are not present, but *only* when the hallowed elements are so *taken*, as in another work (the History of the Papal Transubstantiation) I have more at large declared. Therefore whosoever so receiveth them, at that time when he receiveth them, rightly doth he adore and reverence his Saviour there together with the

[1] p. 59. [2] p. 172. [3] p. 42.

sacramental bread and cup exhibiting his own body and blood unto him. Yet because the Body and Blood is neither sensibly present, (NOR OTHERWAYS AT ALL PRESENT BUT ONLY TO THOSE WHO ARE DULY PREPARED TO RECEIVE THEM, and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally *in that act* united) *the adoration is then and there given to Christ himself, neither is nor ought to be directed to any external sensible object, such as are the blessed elements.* But our kneeling, and the outward gesture of humility and reverence in our bodies, is ordained only to testify and express the inward reverence and devotion of our souls towards our blessed Saviour, who vouchsafed to sacrifice himself for us upon the Cross, and now presenteth himself to be united sacramentally to us, that we may enjoy all the benefits of his mystical passion, and be nourished with the spiritual food of his blessed body and blood unto life eternal." [1]

The adoration that is to be given to Christ in this rite, is not, according to Bishop Cosin, to be given to him as "under the forms of the bread and wine," but as present to the faithful communicant, exhibiting his body and blood to him *in the act of receiving;* and so far from the wicked receiving him, he is "*not at all present but only to those who are duly prepared to receive*" *the elements.*

Bishop Beveridge.

I take next Bishop Beveridge, one of the most learned and estimable prelates of our Church, whose Commentaries on the Articles and the Church Catechism have been already quoted in the preceding Chapter. What his doctrine is, has been, I suppose, pretty clearly demonstrated by the extracts there given.

We have seen, for instance, that he says, in his Exposition of the Articles,—

"If the bread be not really changed into the body of Christ, then *the body of Christ is not really there present;* and if it be not really there present, it is impossible it should be really eaten and received into our bodies as bread is." . . . "It being thus only after a spiritual manner that we receive the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, there can be no other means whereby we can receive him but faith." . . . "Wicked and carnal men miss of the body and blood

[1] See "Additional Notes" at end of Dr. Nicholls's Comment on the Book of Common Prayer, p. 49.

of Christ in the sacrament as well as out of it." . . . "And truly we need not go far to prove this, even *that wicked men do not eat the body and blood of Christ;* for if they eat the body and blood of Christ, they are not wicked men, but such as dwell in Christ and have Christ dwelling in them." [1]

And in his Exposition of the Catechism ;—

"Without faith, as hath been shown, they cannot receive the Body and Blood of Christ *at all*, and therefore not worthily." [2]

But, omitting all notice of decisive passages like these, the *Catena* [3] quotes from his Exposition of the Articles a general statement of our being made "partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist," for the purpose of leading the superficial reader to suppose, that Bishop Beveridge held a doctrine which in the context he has expressly repudiated.

And to the quotation from his Exposition on the Articles are added two extracts from his "Necessity and Advantage of Frequent Communion," the second of which was more particularly referred to in the defence of Archdeacon Denison in justification of his statement as to worship being due to the body and blood of Christ as existing under the forms of the bread and wine—a reference which, I believe, would have made the good Bishop start with amazement and righteous indignation.

The first of these extracts is another so remarkable illustration of the character of this *Catena*, that I shall present it to the reader *with the passages that are cut out in the middle restored to their places*. To mark the words that are omitted in the *Catena*, (their place being supplied by dots,) I shall put them within double hooks :—

"When we hear the words of consecration repeated as they came from our Lord's own mouth, 'This is my body which is given for you,' and 'this is my blood which was shed for you and for many for the remission of sins;' we are then stedfastly to believe, that although the substance of the bread and wine still remain, yet now it is not common bread and wine as to its use; but the Body and Blood of Christ in that sacramental sense wherein He spake the words; [[insomuch that whosoever *duly receive* these *his creatures of bread and wine*, according to Christ's holy institution, in remem-

[1] See pp. 678—680 above.
[2] See p. 715 above.
[3] Doctr. of Real Pres. &c. Pt. ii. pp. 36, 37.

brance of his death and passion, are partakers of his most precious Body and Blood, as it is expressed in the Prayer of Consecration ....]] When it comes to our turn to receive it, then we are to lay aside all thoughts of bread and wine, and the minister, and every thing else that is or can be seen, [[and fix our faith, as it is the evidence of things not seen, wholly and solely upon our blessed Saviour, as offering us his own Body and Blood to preserve our bodies and souls to everlasting life, WHICH WE ARE THEREFORE TO RECEIVE BY FAITH, as it is the substance of things hoped for,]] stedfastly believing it to be, as our Saviour said, 'his Body and Blood,' which our Church teacheth us are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." [1]

And in the same treatise, amidst a host of similar remarks, he thus describes the nature of the Eucharistic rite :—

"So the sacrament of the Lord's Supper both signifies and seals to us the covenant of grace founded in the death of Christ, there represented before our eyes; whereby our faith is strengthened, and we are able to look upon ourselves as entitled to, and interested in, all the blessings which are promised in the said covenant, by the means of that Body and Blood which we there behold as broken and shed for us. For which purpose also Christ himself, in the institution of it, *calls the signs by the name of the Thing signified*, saying, 'This is my body which is broken for you;' and, 'This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' 1 Cor. xi. 24. Matth. xxvi. 28. Whereby he fully assures us, that this is not *common* bread and wine, but his own Body and Blood, not in a carnal, but in a *spiritual* or *sacramental* sense: so that by eating this bread and drinking this cup, we partake of his Body and Blood to all intents and purposes for which the one was broken and the other shed; and that too *as much, or rather more than we could have done it by eating his very Body and drinking his very Blood in a carnal and literal sense.* To the same purpose is that of the Apostle, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?' and 'the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' 1 Cor. x. 16. THOUGH IT BE NOT HIS VERY BODY AND BLOOD ITSELF, it is the *communion of them;* they are both communicated to us: so that if we receive them, as we ought, by faith, we attain the end wherefore his Body was broken and his Blood shed, even the remission of our sins. Which is therefore particularly mentioned by himself in the institu-

[1] I quote from the sixth ed. Lond. 1714. 8vo. pp. 234—237.

tion of the cup. And this is that which our Church teacheth in her Catechism, saying, 'That the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.' *By the faithful: by such as have, and act true faith;* which, as the Apostle saith, 'is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.' *By such* the Body and Blood of Christ is verily and indeed received; AND ONLY BY SUCH. Others see nothing there but bread and wine; but they who have such a faith in Christ's word, by it see his Body and Blood there; their faith itself being the very evidence thereof to them. . . . *Without faith no man can receive any more than plain, though consecrated, bread and wine.* But they who have, and at the same time act, that faith which is the substance of things hoped for, do *by that* verily and indeed receive the Body and Blood of Christ according to his word, when he said, 'This is my Body,' and, 'This is my Blood.'" [1]

Here we see what the Bishop understands by *the sacramental sense* of the words of institution, and in fact his whole doctrine on the subject. And in the same treatise he again says elsewhere,—

"*Without such a faith as this, we can receive nothing but bread and wine* . . . For indeed the whole stress of this great work lies upon our faith. Unless that be duly exerted and acted, though men come to the Lord's Table and feed upon *the outward elements which are there given them,* this is not to eat the Lord's Supper; for that is a spiritual banquet, which cannot be so much as tasted of any, otherwise than by faith." [2]

Of course this is a full reply to the second extract, which is merely a passage justifying kneeling on this ground,—"How can I, by faith, behold my Saviour coming to me and offering to me his own Body and Blood, and not fall down and *worship him?*" The question seems to me a very just one, and I can see no need to attempt to explain it.

Bishop Patrick.

Another of our eminent divines who was quoted in defence of Archdeacon Denison, and particularly of his doctrine, that the wicked eat the real Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, is Bishop Patrick. The extract was from his "Mensa

[1] Ibid. pp. 127—129. [2] Ibid. pp. 210, 211.

Mystica," and was an addition to the *Catena* already mentioned, in which Bishop Patrick is not quoted.

The extract was taken from a portion of the treatise containing practical remarks, in the course of which the signs are, as usual, more than once called by the name of the things signified, and the proof of Bishop Patrick's agreement with Archdeacon Denison is rested upon an instance of the use of this appellation of the signs.

Now a portion of this treatise is specially devoted to a statement of *doctrine* on the subject, and this has been carefully passed over. On what ground, the reader may judge from the following extracts.

After pointing out the blessings we derive from a participation of the Eucharist "as a means of our nearer union with our Lord Christ," which he describes as wholly of a spiritual kind, and consisting especially in our receiving "larger measures" of the Holy Spirit, he proceeds thus:—

"And this is all that is meant by the *real presence* of Christ in this sacrament, which the Church speaks of and believes; as it is one reason likewise of the change which is so much noised, because by his power these things become effectual to so great purposes, when they are holily received. *Our Lord doth call these signs by the name of the things they signify*, because in a spiritual manner his body and blood are present to us, *viz., by the communication of that to us which they did purchase for us.* From the sacred humanity of Christ, life and spirit is derived unto us, as motion is from the head unto the members. And the power of the Godhead doth diffuse the virtue or operation of the human nature, to the enlivening the hearts of men that rightly receive the sacramental pledges. Manna is called spiritual bread, and water that came out of the rock is named spiritual drink, and the rock is said to be Christ, because they did signify him, and were tokens of his presence; and therefore much more may this bread and wine be called his body and blood, and spoken of as if they were himself, because they do more lively represent him, and he hath annexed his presence more powerfully to them. Or as one of the ancients saith, they are called his body and blood, *not because they are properly so*, 'sed quod in se mysterium corporis ejus et sanguinis continent,' *but because they contain in them the mystery of his body and blood.* And this (as I said) is all the change that we are to

understand in them, according as Theodoret doth excellently express it: Christ (saith he) calls them by the name of the things they represent, 'not changing the nature, but adding grace unto the nature.' And what that grace is, I have already told you in this Chapter.[1] So THAT THE REAL PRESENCE IS NOT TO BE SOUGHT IN THE BREAD AND WINE, BUT IN THOSE THAT RECEIVE THEM, according as learned Hooker speaks. For Christ saith first, 'Take and eat;' and then after that, 'This is my body.' Before we take and eat, it is not the body of Christ unto us; but when we take and eat as we ought, then he gives us his whole self, and puts us into possession of all such saving graces as his sacrificed body can yield, and our souls do then need. *The change is in our souls and not in the sacrament;* we are, though not transubstantiated into another body, yet metamorphosed and transformed into another likeness, by the offering up of our bodies to God, which is a piece of this service. Rom. xii. 1, 2. And so some observe that all other meat is received as it is in itself, and no otherwise; but this meat is divers, as it is received. Other meat affecteth and altereth the taste, but here the taste altereth the meat. For if it be worthily received, it is the body and blood of Christ; IF UNWORTHILY, IT IS BUT BARE BREAD AND WINE. But yet this must be cautiously understood when we thus speak; for his presence is with the bread, though not in it. Though it be ONLY IN US, yet it comes with it unto us, *if we will receive him;* because else we shall not know how unworthy persons are said to be 'guilty of his body and blood,' if he be not present with his body and blood to work in men's souls."[2]

Several other similar passages might be added from this treatise, but this seems unnecessary.

But a few lines from his remarks on the way in which, in this case, there may be a real presence of a body locally absent, may be useful.

"We must observe that things at the greatest distance may be united by one spirit of life actuating them both, and so may Christ and we, though we enjoy not his bodily presence. It is truly noted by a most reverend person (A. Usher), that the formal reason of the union that is made between the parts of our body,

[1] And he there describes it as grace not given to the *elements*, but to the *receivers* of the elements; as might be concluded from his next words.

[2] Mensa Mystica; or, a Discourse Concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Sect. i. c. 5. 2nd ed. Lond. 1667. pp. 108—110.

consists not in their continuity and touching of each other, but in the animation of them by one and the same spirit which ties them all together. . . . . [And he proceeds to observe, that this would be the case if the head were as high as heaven and the feet upon the earth, "which must be by virtue of that spirit which is conceived alike present to every part, and therefore that must be taken likewise to be the reason of that union which is among them all."] Just so may you apprehend the union to be between Christ our head, and us his members. Although *in regard of his corporal presence he be in the heavens*, which must receive him until the time of the restitution of all things, Acts iii. 21, yet he is here with us always, even to the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20.) in regard of his Holy Spirit working in us," &c.[1]

And before I dismiss Bishop Patrick, I would just observe again, how little we can judge from incidental phrases, taken by themselves, what an Author's views are; for, in the midst of passages like those we have just quoted, we find him speaking of the sacrament thus; that then Christ "doth exhibit himself unto us *under these shadows of bread and wine.*"[2] His meaning, judged from his doctrine as delivered in the context, as of course it must be, is clear, but the words are open to a totally different sense.

And if any one wishes to see whether Bishop Patrick remained stedfast in this faith, let him consult his "Christian Sacrifice," published at the latter part of his career; where, for instance, he thus speaks:—

"After the bread and wine are deputed, by holy prayer, to God, to be used for a commemoration of Christ's death; though they do not cease to be what they were before, yet they begin to be something which they were not before this consecration, *that is, they become now to us 'visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace;'* and do not merely figure to us the breaking of Christ's body, and the shedding of his blood; but are a pledge of that inward and spiritual grace which they represent. What that grace is, we are taught in our Catechism, when it tells us, that it is, 'The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper:' *that is, they have a real part and portion given them in the death and sufferings of the Lord Jesus;* whose body was broken, and blood shed, for remission of sins. They truly

[1] Ibid. pp. 101, 102.

[2] Ibid. p. 105.

and indeed partake of the virtue of his bloody sacrifice; whereby he hath obtained an eternal redemption for us. *This is the meaning, sure, of partaking of his body and blood, which are here communicated.* Because this bread and wine do not become his body and blood, by ceasing to be bread and wine; *but by tendering them to us as a 'spiritual grace.'* Their efficacy, therefore, and virtue by the Divine favour is made ours. All the effects and benefits of his passion are imparted to us by these, which *in themselves are but God's creatures of bread and wine;* yet, by his appointment, become to us the Body and Blood of his Son. In short, there is nothing which the body and blood of Christ can be to the spirits of men, but by these tokens he exhibits it to us, and gives us an interest in it. This is 'spiritually to eat his flesh and drink his blood;' as both our Church and the ancient speak." . . . . "It is not merely his body and blood, but his body *broken* and blood *shed* (as I said just now) which we are made partakers of. *And that is as much as to say, we are partakers of his death;* the breaking of the body and shedding the blood being the death of him who suffers in that manner. And thus indeed the bread and wine are changed, not by abolishing their substance, but *by turning them to this divine use*, (to which they are deputed by prayer according to Christ's institution,) to render to us the spiritual grace of the broken Body and Blood shed of our Saviour: the principal part of which grace is, remission of sin."[1]

And he quotes with approbation Gregory Nyssen as saying, that the elements "are *called* the Body and Blood of Christ, *in* "*regard of the use to which they are sanctified,* and are his Body "and Blood in regard of *the wonderful effects which are com-*"*municated to the faithful in the use of them;* viz., 'remission of "sin and all other benefits of his passion.'"[2]

And hence, (as every man, possessing but an ordinary amount of information on such subjects, knows, that the elements are so called, and for that reason so called) he hesitates not, in the practical part of this very Treatise, in his "Meditations before the Sacrament," to say, that God "*sets the Body of his Son before you upon your table,*" and that "your cup is filled with his blood."[3]

But what are we to say to one who, pretending to any know-

[1] The Christian Sacrifice; a treatise showing the necessity, end, and manner of receiving the Holy Communion, &c. 16th ed. Lond. 1732. pp. 52—54.

[2] Ibid. p. 58.

[3] Ibid. p. 131.

ledge on such subjects, quotes such expressions as proving the writer's agreement with the doctrine of the Authors under review? The reader shall decide.

Dr. Richard Sherlock.

The extracts just given from Bishop Patrick show us how little we can depend upon phrases occurring in a devotional work to show us the doctrine of the writer. What would be our conclusion respecting the views held by Bishop Patrick, if all we had to judge from was, his saying that Christ "exhibits himself unto us under the shadows of bread and wine," and that God "sets the Body of his Son before us on our Table?"

Now it is in the light of this consideration that we must view the extracts from Dr. Sherlock, given to us in the *Catena*, and urged in the defence of Archdeacon Denison; which are taken from a practical and devotional work, entitled, "The Practical Christian, or the devout penitent; a book of devotion."

Any man in search of the truth, who has sufficient information on the subject to know the way in which the phrases that occur in these passages are used in devotional works, will admit, that it is impossible to infer from them the views of the writer. An ignorant reader, desirous of seeing his own doctrine established by them, will run without hesitation to the desired conclusion. The words, to him, will be plain beyond dispute. But one who knows, that a number of our best divines who have pronounced plainly against the doctrine that the words, *primâ facie*, might appear to imply, have used them precisely in the same way, will not find their way to the same conclusion. He will understand, that the doctrine of those who so used them, can only be ascertained from their *dogmatical* statements on the subject.

I know not, indeed, what favorable consequence of any importance would ensue to Archdeacon's Denison's cause, if I admitted, that the expressions used by Dr. Sherlock betrayed a leaning to similar views to those of Archdeacon Denison. It would be wonderful indeed, if, among all the thousands of works published by clergymen of our Church, none should be found in which there are incidental expressions appearing to favor his doctrine.

Such a thing is not, in the nature of things, to be expected. What is wanted for the Archdeacon's defence is, a number of divines of note who have (as he has done) *formally propounded such doctrine, and taught it as the doctrine of the Church of England, without being called in question for it.*

But nevertheless, considering the way in which the phrases in question are used by Dr. Sherlock, I do not think that we can draw any such conclusion from them.

He speaks of "seeing *with the eye of faith* Christ really present under the species of bread and wine," and of having "received *in faith*" his "precious Body and Blood veiled under the species of bread and wine," and of a wicked person "receiving Christ's holy Body and Blood into his soul." [1]

Now, as to the last of these phrases, we have seen even Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who has written largely and earnestly *against* the doctrine in support of which these words are quoted, using exactly the same phrase; evidently referring merely to the reception of the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ by one whose soul was impure. And in like manner the phrase as to the presence of Christ *to faith* (for such is the expression) "under the species of bread and wine," occurs in a similar way in the works of those who have most expressly rejected and condemned the doctrine attached to that phrase by the Authors under review. We are to understand such a phrase "figuratively," Bishop Bilson tells us, and then it is correct; "for we confess," he adds, "that Christ worketh in us, and *presenteth* "*himself unto us in these mysteries, as it were in certain veils and* "*coverings*; which *mystically*, by way of *signification* and *spiritual* "*operation, contain and clothe his grace and truth*; but *not really*, "nor by material or corporal inclusion;" and he proceeds immediately to deny, that Christ is "*substantially* closed within the forms of bread and wine." [2] An expression of a very similar kind we have also just seen used by Bishop Lake,[3] while his language in the context distinctly repudiates the doctrine supposed by some to be involved in it. And, as already noticed, Bishop Patrick

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 129, 130.
[2] See p. 798 above. [3] See p. 838 above.

speaks of Christ "exhibiting himself unto us under the shadows of bread and wine." [1]

And though it is the ordinary phrase for the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and therefore open to serious objection, it certainly is capable of a different sense, as even our Martyrologist John Fox has shown, who points out that if we understand the word "forms" in the sense of the elements not deprived of their substance, we may give an orthodox interpretation of the expression, that the Body and Blood of Christ are present under the forms of bread and wine, understanding by it that the body of Christ is there present "to the inward eyes of faith and mouth of the soul." [2] As Bishop Bilson says, "add *figuratively*," and there is no difficulty.

And it is of the forms *as viewed by faith* that Sherlock is speaking, which is a very different matter from laying it down *as a dogma*, that the body and blood of Christ are *actually and really* under the forms of the bread and wine.

Nay, not only is it possible that Dr. Sherlock may have used the phrase in that sense, but his Exposition of the Catechism, as formerly quoted,[3] seems to show that he *must* have used it in that sense; because he there says, that while the bread and wine are "taken and received *corporally*," the body and blood of Christ are "taken and received *spiritually* of every *true faithful* SOUL;" showing that he did not hold such a conjunction of the body and blood of Christ with the elements, as that, to receive the one, was to receive the other. He is, no doubt, speaking of that which may be said to be really present *to the eye of faith* under the bread and wine—faith recognising the bread and wine as effectual signs of that Body and Blood, instrumental in the case of the faithful for bringing us into immediate and intimate communion with them,—rather than of what is *actually* present under the bread and wine.

But, whatever view we may take of these phrases, certainly incidental expressions of this kind, standing alone in a devotional treatise, and used probably without any fear of their being interpreted in a Romish sense, are not sufficient to convict a

[1] See p. 862 above. [2] Acts and Monuments, sub a. 1539. ed. 1846. v. 266.
[3] See p. 702 above.

man of being committed to a system of doctrine such as that of Archdeacon Denison, still less of teaching it.

Archbishop Bramhall.

In the defence of Archdeacon Denison, Archbishop Bramhall was quoted more particularly on two points; first, the adoration of Christ's body as present under the form of the bread, and secondly, the effect of consecration as producing this presence.

Now the passage more particularly referred to on the first point was this;—

"We deny not a venerable respect unto the consecrate elements, not only as love-tokens sent us by our best friend, but as the instruments ordained by our Saviour to convey to us the merits of his passion; but for the Person of Christ, God forbid that we should deny him divine worship at any time, and especially in the use of this holy sacrament; we believe with St. Austin, that 'no man eats of that flesh, but first he adores:'—but that which offends us is this, that you teach and require all men to adore the very sacrament with Divine honour." [1]

I am at a loss to understand in what possible way this passage can benefit the Archdeacon's cause. It seems to me that the Archbishop has replied just as any supporter of the doctrine I advocate would reply, maintaining the propriety of the adoration of *the Person of Christ "in the use of this Holy Sacrament,"* but objecting to adoration addressed to *the Sacrament;* which is the adoration advocated by the Archdeacon, who expressly maintains, that Christ's body is one part of *the sacrament lying upon the table,* and that that body is to be worshipped as forming *part of the sacrament,* as being under the form of the bread.

The Archdeacon's doctrine, that the Body and Blood of Christ form part of the sacrament lying upon the table and received by the communicants, necessarily leads him to the Romish error on the subject of *adoration.* The Romanists do not hold, that worship is to be given to the sign or symbol of Christ's body and blood, but to the sacrament as consisting of Christ's Body and Blood in conjunction with and under the forms of the signs

[1] Answer to M. De la Milletière, Works, Oxf. ed. 1842. vol. i. pp. 20, 21.

and symbols of them. And this is precisely the Archdeacon's notion; the only difference being, that he considers the substance of the bread and wine to remain, and that the Romanists do not. If the sacrament was what the Archdeacon defines it to be, it *would* demand our adoration, *as a whole*. But our divines, while they justly maintain, that adoration is due to the Person of Christ in the sacramental *rite*, refuse adoration to the sacramental *thing*, as if the Body and Blood of Christ formed a part of it.

And so again elsewhere Archbishop Bramhall expresses his objection to the Romish doctrine in this way; that he regards as an abuse "their injunction to all communicants to adore, *not only Christ in the use of the sacrament, to which we do readily assent*, but to adore the sacrament itself." [1]

What he assents to is, *the adoration of Christ in the use of the sacrament*, about which I have no dispute with the Archdeacon; but he repudiates the adoration of the sacrament itself, which nevertheless, if the Archdeacon's definition of it were correct, would demand adoration.

And according to this repeated statement of his doctrine, we must understand another passage quoted from him, which occurs further on in the same work:—

"Again, 'The sacrament is to be adored,' said the Council of Trent: that is, 'formally the Body and Blood of Christ,' say some of your authors; *we say the same;*—'the sacrament,' that is, 'the species of bread and wine,' say others; that we deny, and esteem it to be idolatrous." [2]

It is clear that this briefly-expressed statement must be understood in conformity with his own expressions occurring only a few pages before.

The passage quoted to prove, that the effect of consecration is such as the Archdeacon affirms it to be, was given in the defence of the Archdeacon from the *Catena*, where it stands thus,—

"Abate us Transubstantiation, AND those things which are consequent of their determination of the manner of Presence, and we

[1] Replic. to Bp. of Chalcedon, § 2. Works, ii. 35, 36.
[2] Ibid. § 7. Works, ii. 87.

have no difference with them in this particular. They who are ordained priests ought to have power to consecrate the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, to make them present." [1]

Now first, I ask, why this last sentence is garbled at the concluding and important part of it? For, Bramhall's words are,—"that is, to make them present *after such manner as they were present at the first institution.*"[2] These words were not added by Bramhall for nothing, and carry us back to that original celebration of the rite in which our Blessed Lord was *sitting at the Table;* and though the Archbishop has unfortunately not explained his meaning, it is not difficult to understand it, as the very omission of the words in the *Catena* shows; for it is clear that the compiler thought the passage told better for his doctrine *without them* than with them, otherwise he would not have stopped where not even a comma divides the words from those that follow.

That, when the elements have been consecrated for the purpose of celebrating this rite, the consequence of that consecration is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are present with them *to the faithful communicant* is not denied; and this is all that Bramhall's words express as it regards the question now before us.

Another quotation in the *Catena* seems to be cited on account of its saying, that Protestants do not deny, that "the sacrament" is "the Body of Christ;"[3] which of course they do not, for as the Archbishop justly observes, this "were to contradict the words of Christ, 'This is my body,'" and therefore the passage is irrelevant. The question is, *in what sense* it is Christ's Body.

The argument from the remaining extracts in the *Catena* amounts to this,[4] that it would have been better if the Church of Rome and others had not raised curious questions as to the

[1] Doctr. of Real Pres. &c. Pt. i. p. 125.

[2] Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Vindicated. Works, vol. iii. p. 165.

[3] Doctr. of Real Pres. &c. Pt. i. p. 125. The passage is from Bramhall's Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon. § 6. Works, ii. 211.

[4] I say this, because when he observes, "a true Real Presence . . . . . no genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny," he only says what is freely and cheerfully admitted, nay contended for. And what he thought "a true Real Presence" to be, may be judged of by his adding, that De la Milletière's special adversary Albertinus (or, Aubertin) did not deny it. And what Aubertin's view was, I need not stop to describe.

precise manner in which Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist,[1] in which I heartily agree with him. But seeing that the questions have been raised, and that most unorthodox doctrine, *carrying many evil consequences with it,* has been forced upon the Church, and that our Church has formally repudiated such doctrine, and made all her ministers do so too, I do not understand these remarks of the Archbishop as justifying any minister of that Church in preaching and inculcating doctrine contrary to his subscription. It is quite true, indeed, that we do not, as the Archbishop says, put the question of the manner of Christ's presence "among the Articles of our faith," so as to make the belief of one view or another *essential to salvation,* but our Church *has* placed certain views upon the subject among those Articles of belief which she requires her ministers to maintain.[2]

I must also add, that though the Archbishop has not entered into the full discussion of the matter, he has very distinctly stated what he thinks of such *Catenas* of passages from the Fathers as that of Dr. Pusey, to prove the doctrine of a real presence of the substance of Christ's body in the sacramental elements, for he says,—

"Neither will it avail them anything at all, that the Fathers have sometimes used such expressions of 'seeing Christ,' of 'touching Christ' in the sacrament, of 'fastening our teeth in his flesh,' and 'making our tongues red in his blood.' . . . . The Fathers do not say, that such expressions are true, not only sacramentally or figuratively, ... but also properly and in the things themselves. *The Fathers never meant by these forms of speech to determine the*

[1] Occurring in his Answ. to M. De la Milletière. Works, vol. i. pp. 8—11.

[2] I add here, as I am writing not as a mere partisan but for the manifestation of the truth, that there is one passage of Archbishop Bramhall (not quoted in the *Catena*) which seems to me to have been written in forgetfulness that our Church has positively determined some points connected with this matter; for, speaking of the presence of Christ in the sacrament, he says,—"Whether it be corporeally or spiritually, (I mean not, only after the manner of a spirit, but, in a spiritual sense) whether it be in the soul only, or in the host also; and if in the host, whether by consubstantiation or transubstantiation; whether by production, or adduction, or conservation, or assumption, or by whatsoever other way bold and blind men dare conjecture;—*we determine not.* 'Motum sentimus, modum nescimus, Præsentiam credimus.'" (Answ. to M. De la Milletière, Works, i. 22.) Now certainly it will be admitted, that against transubstantiation our Church *has* determined; and also, I suppose, against a corporeal presence in the sense here meant. The passage therefore would prove too much for Archdeacon Denison.

manner of the Presence, (which was not dreamt of in their days,) but to *raise the devotion of their hearers and readers;* to advertise the people of God, that they should not *rest in the external symbols or signs*, but principally be intent upon the invisible grace: which was both lawful and commendable for them to do." [1]

And on the assertion, that the real Body of Christ may be said to be broken, because the external part of that sacrament, of which it is said to form a part, is broken, he says,—

"They might as well say, that the Body and Blood of Christ becomes fusty and sour, as often as the species of bread and wine before their corruption become fusty and sour." [2]

This alone disposes of a host of Dr. Pusey's quotations from the Fathers.

Bishop Forbes.

Among other Authors quoted in the *Catena*,[3] and urged in the defence of Archdeacon Denison,[4] is Bishop Forbes.

Now this reference is altogether inadmissible. The question is, what doctrine was held by the divines of *the English Church*, who are bound by the XXXIX. Articles. But Bishop Forbes never belonged to the English Church, and was no more bound by the XXXIX. Articles than a Minister of the Church of Rome. He belonged, throughout the whole of his life, to the Episcopal Church in Scotland. He was born at Aberdeen, and was educated and graduated at the College there, and was afterwards made Principal of the Marischal College, and finally, a few months before his death in 1634, was appointed by Charles I., Bishop of Edinburgh. It was nothing to him, therefore, what our XXXIX. Articles taught. He was not bound by them. He had nothing to do with them. His Church had not adopted them. True, he was *offered*, on account of his learning, the Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford, but he *did not accept it*, and therefore that fact does not in the least alter

[1] Answ. to M. De la Milletière, Works, i. 13, 14. [2] Ibid. p. 13.

[3] Doctr. of Real Pres. &c. Pt. i. p. 126.

[4] The passages referred to in the defence occur in his "Considerationes Modestæ," pp. 434 and 438, and were quoted to prove his agreement with Archdeacon Denison in teaching that adoration is due to the Body and Blood of Christ as existing under the forms of the bread and wine.

the state of the case. The *Catena* erroneously states, that he was Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, intending us, I suppose, to infer, that he must have signed the XXXIX. Articles on that occasion. But the inference is not a necessary one, and the *alleged fact* is a *misstatement*.

The name of Bishop Forbes, therefore, must be *withdrawn* from the list of witnesses as to the doctrine of the Church of England, unless a deliberate attempt is to be made to mislead the reader.[1]

Dean Jackson.

The passage quoted from Dean Jackson in the *Catena*,[2] and alleged, as there quoted, in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, more particularly as sanctioning his doctrine that the Body and Blood of Christ are so present in the consecrated elements that the wicked necessarily receive them in receiving those elements, is one which it is only necessary to read with a little attention to see that it is entirely misquoted for such a purpose. Dean Jackson's doctrine will clearly appear from passages which I shall quote presently. But first let us consider that which is adduced in the *Catena*.

Now, what is his definition, as there given, of the doctrine of the Real Presence? He says,—

"When we say that Christ is really present in the sacrament, our meaning is, that *as God He is present* in an exrtaordinary manner, after such a manner as He was present (before his incarnation) in his Sanctuary the Ark of his Covenant; and *by the power of his Godhead* thus extraordinarily present, he DIFFUSETH THE VIRTUE OR OPERATION OF HIS HUMAN NATURE, either to the

[1] On the grounds above stated, I decline entering into the case of Bishop Forbes, because it is not relevant to the point at issue. It proves nothing as to the doctrine of our Church or her divines. But it may here be observed, that the object of the book is, not to lay down the true doctrine, but to soften the differences between divines, and point out grounds on which doctrines objected to may be tolerated, and to promote concord in the Church, but without any reference to any particular standard of faith such as the XXXIX. Articles. The book, therefore, is peculiarly open to a use being made of it not contemplated by the author, and his statements being drawn to a very different purpose from what he intended them for. Such *irenical* writings, professedly putting the best aspect on all statements of doctrine, may be quoted in favor almost of anything.

[2] Doctr. of Real Pres. &c. Pt. i. pp. 44—46.

vivification or hardening of their hearts, who receive the sacramental pledges." [1]

Can there be a doctrine more thoroughly different from that of the Authors under review than this? Instead of the real Body and Blood of Christ being in or under the forms of the bread and wine, the capital error of those Authors, and the foundation of all their other erroneous statements, the only presence which Dean Jackson allows is, *the presence of Christ's Godhead diffusing the virtue or operation of his human nature.* With this doctrine I find no fault; though I think it would have been more correct, and more consistent with what Dean Jackson himself has said elsewhere, to have spoken of this as the effect of the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Dean Jackson, therefore, opposes the very foundation upon which their system of doctrine is built. He denies any such Presence as they contend for; and therefore what he says as to the presence of Christ to the wicked *applies to a totally different matter from that to which it is applied in the Catena.* According to Dean Jackson's doctrine, there is no such eating and drinking *at all* of the Body and Blood of Christ, by the unworthy or the worthy, as that which Archdeacon Denison maintains. The real Body and Blood of Christ are *not,* according to him, in the elements, or under their forms, *to be thus eaten.*

All that Dean Jackson admits in this passage respecting the wicked eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ, is, that they eat and drink them "*sacramentally;*" which *all admit;* or, as he himself specially explains it, in order apparently to prevent the possibility of any misconception, "they eat that *bread* which *sacramentally* is his body, and drink that cup which *sacramentally* is his blood."

But he adds, that "Christ is really present in the sacrament, as well to the unworthy as to the faithful receivers." And, *taking his own definition of the nature of this real presence, as we are bound to do,* nobody will deny this. That the Godhead of Christ is present in the sacrament to the unworthy as well as to the worthy recipient, is beyond question.

[1] The passage occurs in his work, On the Creed, bk. xi. c. 4. Works, vol. iii. p. 334.

And Dean Jackson maintains, that by the power of his Godhead thus present, he diffuses the virtue or operation of his human nature to the vivification of the hearts of the worthy recipients, and *the hardening of the hearts of the unworthy recipients*. Now that Christ is so present by his Godhead, and thus present through the Holy Spirit, to produce *an effect upon the hearts of the unworthy* as well as the worthy, is freely granted. And whether we should express this truth in the precise words which Dean Jackson has here adopted or not, is another question, and one which does not affect our controversy with Archdeacon Denison. Our controversy with him is, whether the real body and blood of Christ are so in or under the forms of the elements, that the wicked, in taking the one, necessarily and in the same act take the other. And this notion is clearly repudiated by Dean Jackson. The notion, that the Holy Spirit gives to the unworthy recipient, when taking the sacramental body and blood, the virtue of that body and blood to the hardening of his heart (which seems to be Dean Jackson's notion), is no justification of the doctrine of a real presence of the substance of Christ's body and blood in the elements, and a consequent eating and drinking of that real body and blood by the wicked. And I doubt whether Archdeacon Denison himself would adopt the expression, that the hearts of the wicked are hardened in this ordinance by an impartation to *their souls* of *the virtue* of Christ's Body and Blood.

Nevertheless under this somewhat peculiar expression it is easy to see the general doctrine of Dean Jackson; and what it was may be more clearly seen by the following extracts:—

"We may consecrate the elements of bread and wine, and administer them so consecrated as undoubted pledges of his Body and Blood, by which the New Covenant was sealed, and the general pardon purchased. Yet unless he grant some actual influence of his Spirit, and suffer such virtue to go out from his human nature now placed in his Sanctuary, as he once did unto the woman that was cured of her issue of blood; unless this virtue do as immediately reach our souls as it did her body, *we do not really receive his Body and Blood with the elements of bread and wine.* We do not so receive them as to have our sins remitted or dissolved by them: we do not, by receiving them, become of his flesh and of his bones."[1]

[1] On the Creed, bk. x. c. 55. Works, iii. 306, 307.

Here he clearly identifies the *real reception* of Christ's Body and Blood, with a salutary reception of them.

He tells us also, that there is not "any other kind of local "presence or compresence with these elements, than is in bap- "tism. The orthodoxal antients use the same language for "expressing his Presence in Baptism and in the Eucharist; they "stick not to say, that Christ is *present or latent in the water*, "as well as in the elements of bread and wine." [1]

And speaking of the Lutheran notion of the ubiquity of Christ's Body, he says that they are bound to tell us, whether it be everywhere with "a distinction of parts in it, as of his head from his feet, or his right hand from his left;" and if the body supposed to be present has no such distinction of parts, he says,—

"*Let them call it what they list, it is not in any language (besides their own and the modern Romish Churches) a Body, as having no properties of a body.*" [And he adds,]—"If they will call that *a Body*, which WE SHOULD CALL A SPIRITUAL INFLUENCE OR VIRTUAL PRESENCE (so we may know what they really mean by this word *Body*) let them enjoy their dialect." .... "If they say that Christ's whole body is intirely everywhere, or every part of it every- where, then either he hath no right hand, or his right hand is in his left; either he hath no human body, or else his whole body is in his little finger. But to be after this manner intirely everywhere, is proper only unto God." [2]

Here he expressly repudiates that notion of a Real Presence which is advocated by the Authors under review, observing that such a Body as they imagine "is *not* in any language *a body*, as having no properties of a body;" and he contrasts with it the doctrine of the Presence as held by the Church of England, which is that of "*a spiritual influence or virtual presence.*"

And proceeding afterwards to speak of the way in which our Blessed Lord acts in his present state of exaltation, he says,—

"Nor may we again, by broken inductions, gathered from the effects or efficacy of natural bodies, or created substances upon other bodies, take upon us to limit or bound the efficacy of Christ's body upon the bodies or souls which he hath taken to his protection. We

[1] On the Creed, bk. x. c. 55. Works, iii. 300.
[2] Ibid. bk. xi. c. 3. iii. 321, 322.

may not collect, that Christ's Body, because comprehended within the heavens, can exercise no real operation upon our bodies or souls here on earth; or that the live influence of his glorified human nature may not be diffused through the world as he shall be pleased to dispense it, or to sow the seeds of life issuing from it, sometimes here, sometimes there. This *real* though *virtual influence* of Christ's human nature is haply that which the Lutherans call the real ubiquitary presence of Christ's body.[1] Luther himself never denied Christ's very body or human nature to be comprehended within the heavens; and yet he affirmed it to be present with us in such a manner as the sound is present with us, which is really made or caused a great way from us. And we may not deny this real influence or virtual presence of Christ to be in a manner infinite; or at least to extend itself to all created substances, that are capable of it, in what created distance soever they be from his body; whose residence we believe to be in the highest heavens, at the right hand of God."

And having illustrated this from the example of the sun, which, at any distance, might be made able to "enlighten the earth" and "give life and vigour" to things on the earth, he adds,—

"The only sure anchor of all our hopes for a joyful resurrection unto the life of glory, is the mystical union, which must be wrought here on earth, betwixt Christ's human nature glorified and our mortal or dissoluble nature. The Divine nature indeed is the prime fountain of life to all; but, though inexhaustible in itself, yet a fountain whereof we cannot drink, save as it is derived unto us through the human nature of Christ."[2]

And then comes a passage which places Dean Jackson's doctrine on the subject beyond dispute:—

"The Spirit of life, whereby our adoption and election is sealed unto us, is *the real participation of Christ's Body, which was broken, and of Christ's blood, which was shed for us.* This is the true and punctual meaning of our Apostle's speech, 1 Cor. xv. 45. 'The first Adam was made a living soul,' or, as the Syriac hath it, 'animale corpus,' 'an enlivened body;' 'but the second Adam was made a quickening spirit;' and immediately becometh such to all

[1] I wish this could be supposed to be the case, but their language clearly forbids it.

[2] Ibid. pp. 325, 326.

those which as truly bear his image by the Spirit of regeneration, which issues from him, as they have borne the image of the first Adam by natural propagation. And this again is the true and punctual meaning of our Saviour's words, John vi. 63, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you are spirit and life.' For so he had said in the verses before, to such as were offended at his words, 'What and if you should see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?' The implication contained in the connexion between these two verses and the precedent is this; That Christ's virtual presence, or the influence of life, *which his human nature was to distil from his heavenly throne*, should be more profitable to such as were capable of it, than his *bodily presence;* than the bodily eating of his flesh and blood could be, although it had been convertible into their bodily substance. THIS DISTILLATION OF LIFE AND IMMORTALITY FROM HIS GLORIFIED HUMAN NATURE, IS THAT WHICH THE ANCIENT AND ORTHODOXAL CHURCH DID MEAN IN THEIR FIGURATIVE AND LOFTY SPEECHES OF CHRIST'S REAL PRESENCE, OR OF EATING HIS VERY FLESH AND DRINKING HIS VERY BLOOD IN THE SACRAMENT. AND THE SACRAMENTAL BREAD IS CALLED HIS BODY, AND THE SACRAMENTAL WINE HIS BLOOD, AS FOR OTHER REASONS, SO ESPECIALLY FOR THIS, THAT THE VIRTUE OR INFLUENCE OF HIS BLOODY SACRIFICE IS MOST PLENTIFULLY AND MOST EFFECTUALLY DISTILLED FROM HEAVEN UNTO THE WORTHY RECEIVERS OF THE EUCHARIST."[1]

BISHOP FIELD.

Another witness quoted in the *Catena*,[2] and cited in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, is Dr. Theophilus Field,[3] Bishop of Llandaff and afterwards of St. David's and Hereford.

But the passages quoted from this treatise (which of course are the most plausible that could be found in it for the purpose in view) contain nothing in support of the doctrine of the Authors under review.

The only statements made in them that I can suppose likely

[1] Ibid. p. 328.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. pp. 17—22.

[3] From his work entitled "A Christian's Preparation to the Worthy Receiving of the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Lond. 1622." 12mo.

to be insisted upon as maintaining the doctrine here controverted, are these.

First, it is said, that "the same sacrament of Christ his blessed "Body and Blood, 'mors est malis, vita bonis,' as Aquinas "speaketh; it is death to the wicked and unworthy, and life to "the godly and worthy receiver."[1]

But there is nothing here which is denied by any one. No doubt it is *the same sacrament* of Christ's blessed Body and Blood which is death to the wicked and life to the godly; as being *the instrument* through which, as accompanied by a blessing or a curse, these different effects are produced. But what then?

The compiler of the *Catena*, indeed, has endeavoured to extract his doctrine out of the passage by interpolating without authority, and against the manifest sense of the passage, a comma after the word "Christ;" and so it was read from the *Catena* in the defence of Archdeacon Denison. But the passage as it stands written by the Author has not an atom of evidence in favor of the Archdeacon's doctrine. Before he can apply it to that purpose, he must first prove that Bishop Field held the "sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood" either to *be* Christ's real Body and Blood, or to *contain* them. And to save him unnecessary trouble, I will add here a passage occurring *between two that are quoted* by the compiler of the *Catena*, but which he has *forgotten to give*:—

"There is no one sentence of Holy Scripture which saith, that we cannot by this sacrament be made partakers of Christ his Body and Blood, except they be first materially contained in the consecrated elements of bread and wine, or the bread and wine be substantially changed, the one into the Body, the other into the Blood of Christ."[2]

The other statement is, that in the Sacrament there are two things, an earthly and a heavenly, which are conjoined—a statement which, if barely and curtly made, might perhaps serve the Archdeacon's purpose with an inexperienced reader.

[1] Christian's Preparation, &c., p. 2. Doctrine of Real Presence, &c., Pt. ii. p. 17.

[2] Christian's Preparation, &c. p. 58.

But the good Bishop's accompanying words spoil the argument altogether, for in the first place he uses the words with reference to *both* sacraments, and no one dreams of a conjunction of the Holy Spirit with the water of baptism such as Archdeacon Denison supposes between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ; and secondly, he limits the reception of the heavenly part to the worthy receiver. For after speaking of "the two sacraments, Baptism and the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood," which he calls "*the seals* which God useth to apply unto me in particular that which Christ wrought for all the world in general," he says,—

"In BOTH *the sacraments*, there be two things to be considered; there is an earthly thing, which we see and feel with our outward senses; and there is a heavenly and spiritual thing *or grace*, which we cannot see, but by faith. Both these parts are inseparably united, and cannot be separated one from another. *He that is rightly fitted for the receiving of the sacrament, doth receive both these parts together*, namely the earthly with the heavenly, and the heavenly with the earthly, which are so inseparably conjoined by God (in a *sacramental union*) that he that goeth about to separate them, must needs run himself upon a curse." [1]

And he repeats afterwards, with particular reference to "the Communion," that "he that doth *receive the one rightly*, doth also necessarily receive the other." [2]

Here the conjunction is evidently represented as taking place, not *before* the administration and independently of the use to which the elements are applied, but *in the administration*,—for the words apply to Baptism as much as to the Eucharist,—and *so*, that the *worthy recipient only* receives the heavenly part of the sacrament.

The word "sacrament," it will be observed, is not here used to describe the sacramental *thing*, but the sacramental *rite*.

Dr. John Donne.

From the writings of Dr. Donne two passages are quoted in the *Catena*,[3] the second of which was specially urged in the defence of Archdeacon Denison in support of his dogma that wor-

[1] Ibid. pp. 54, 55. Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. p. 21.
[2] Ibid. p. 57. Doctr. &c. p. 20.
[3] Doctrine of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 46—48.

ship is due to Christ's Body and Blood as present under the forms of the bread and wine, and thus forming part of "the sacrament," or sacramental *thing* received by all the communicants. I state again the Archdeacon's doctrine, because it is necessary that the reader should not confound it with *the worship of Christ in the use of the sacrament*, which is freely admitted and maintained.

Now, to take the first of these passages, we find, as usual, that the words are perfectly consistent with orthodox doctrine, and only to be warped in another direction by an unorthodox meaning being attached to them, and that *the very next words* to the passage quoted, show, that Dr. Donne's doctrine was not that in support of which the passage is cited. For Dr. Donne, after speaking of the change that passes upon the bread by consecration, says,—"And therefore 'Cum non dubitavit, &c.' "(Aug.) 'since Christ forbore not to say, This is my body, "when he gave the sign of his body,' why should we forbear "to say of that bread, This is Christ's body, which is the sacra- "ment of his body?"

And there the citation ends; but Dr. Donne goes on to use words which demonstrate that he did not hold the body itself to be really present there, observing,—"You would have said at "noon, This light *is* the sun; and you will say now, This light "*is* the candle. *That light was not the sun, this light is not the* "*candle; but it is that portion of air which the sun did then, and* "*which the candle doth now enlighten. We say the sacramental* "*bread is the body of Christ, because God hath shed his ordinance* "*upon it, and made it of another nature* IN THE USE, *though not* "*in the substance.*"[1]

And, describing in the context the nature of the change that passes upon the bread on consecration, he says, that it is "not the same bread which was presented before," *because* "it is severed and appropriated by God, in that ordinance, to *another use:* it is other bread, *so as a Judge is another man upon the bench, than he is at home, in his own house.*"[2]

But there is another passage in one of his Sermons which settles the whole question at once, where he expressly denies that Christ's body can be in divers places at once.

[1] Eighty Sermons. Lond. 1640. fol. serm. 4. p. 37. [2] Ibid. p. 36.

On the words of the angel,—"He is not here, *for* he is risen," he says,—

"This '*for*,' ('for he is risen') this particle of argumentation, the angel opposes prophetically, and by way of prevention, both against that *heresy of Rome*, That the body of Christ *may be in divers places at once*, by the way of Transubstantiation, and against that dream of the Ubiquitaries, That the body of Christ must necessarily be in all places at once, by communication of the Divine nature. For, if the angel argue fairly, logically, sincerely, ('He is not here, for he is risen,') then there is no necessity, there is *no possibility* of this omnipresence, *or this multipresence*, for then the angel's argument might have been denied, and they might have replied, What though he be risen, he may be here too, for he may be *in divers places*. But the angel *concludes us* in this '*for*;' He cannot be here, *for* he is risen. Because he is risen, he cannot be here in the sepulchre, so, as that you may embalm his body. Because he is ascended, he cannot be here, *here in the sacrament*, so, as you may break *or eat that body*."[1]

Now this passage settles the question as to Dr. Donne's maintaining the adoration of Christ's body as present under the forms of the bread and wine; for he holds that his body cannot be really present in divers places at once. And therefore when he says, in the second passage quoted in the *Catena*, that "that which we receive is to be adored, for we receive Christ: he is *res sacramenti*, the form, the essence, the substance, the soul of the sacrament; and *sacramentum sine re sacramenti, mors est*, to take the body, and not the soul, the bread and not Christ, is death: but he that feels Christ in the receiving of the sacrament, and will not bend his knee, would scarce bend his knee, if he saw him"[2]—he is speaking of the adoration of Christ himself in the reception of the sacrament, not as really present in substance under the forms of the bread and wine, but as really present with them in power and efficacy, though corporally in heaven, to every faithful communicant.

And it will be observed, that in this passage it is clearly supposed, that we *may* "take the *bread* and *not Christ*."

To affirm from one or two sentences, taken out of their con-

[1] Ibid. Serm. 25. p. 248.

[2] Doctrine of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. p. 47; or, Serm. 68. p. 693.

text, and apart from all consideration of the general statements of an author on the subject, what his views are on any point, is a proceeding which in worldly matters would go under a very hard name, and certainly deserves as little respect in matters where the interests of Christ's truth are at stake as in any earthly concerns.

And I will conclude this notice of Dr. Donne with a passage which was written by him with the special object of rebuking such errors as those we are now combating. It is in a sermon on the text, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died," (John xi. 21.,) and is this :—

"This then was one weakness in these sisters' faith, that it carried them not up to the consideration of Christ as God. And then another rose out of that, *That they insisted so much, relied so much, upon his corporal and personal presence*, and promised themselves more from that than he had ever given them ground for; which was that which Christ diverted Mary from, when after his resurrection manifesting himself to her, and she flying unto him with that impatient zeal and that impetuous devotion, 'Rabboni, Master, My Master,' Christ said to her, 'Touch me not, for I am not ascended to my Father;' that is, *Dwell not upon this passionate consideration of my bodily and personal presence, but send thy thoughts and thy reverence and thy devotion and thy holy amorousness up, whither I am going, to the right hand of my Father, and consider me, contemplate me* THERE. S. Peter had another holy distemper of another kind, upon the personal presence of Christ. He was so astonished at his presence in the power of a miracle, that he fell down at his feet, and said, 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' These sisters longed for him, and S. Peter longed as much to be delivered of him; both out of weakness and error. *So is it an error and a weakness to attribute too much or too little to Christ's presence in his sacraments or other ordinances.* To imprison Christ in *opere operato*, to conclude him so, as that *where that action is done, Christ must necessarily be*, and necessarily work, this is to say weakly with these sisters, 'Lord, if thou hadst been here, our brother had not died:' as long as we are present at thine ordinance, thou art present with us. But to banish Christ from these holy actions, and to say, That he is no otherwise present, or works no otherwise in those actions, than in other times and places, this is to say with Peter, in his astonishment, '*Exi a me Domine*,' 'O Lord,

depart from me:' it is enough that thy sacrament be a sign; I do not look that it should be a seal or a conduit of grace. This is the danger, this is the distemper, to ascribe too much or too little to God's visible ordinances and institutions: either to say with those holy sisters, 'Lord, if thou hadst been here our brother had not died;' if we have a sacrament, if we have a sermon, all is well, we have enough; or else with Peter, '*Exi a me*,' Leave me to myself, to my private motions, to my bosom inspirations, and I need no church-work, no sermons, no sacraments, no such assistances." [1]

Rev. George Herbert.

The language quoted in the *Catena*,[2] and from it in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, from George Herbert, is so evidently language of a sacramental and symbolical nature, that I cannot conceive any one seriously raising out of it a system of doctrine like that of the Authors under review.

In his "Priest to the Temple, or, the Country Parson," Herbert, speaking of "the country parson," says,—"Especially at communion time he is in great confusion, as being not only to receive God, but to *break and administer Him*." [3]

And in his Poems entitled, "The Temple," he speaks of "God vouchsafing to become our food," and the priest's hands "conveying him," and says that "God is here prepared and drest, and the feast God." [4]

Now either this language is highly figurative and symbolical, or it is blasphemous. Do we "break God" in the Eucharist? And as to the plea that Christ may be said to be broken there because the external part of that Sacrament of which his body is said to form a portion is broken, I say *with Archbishop Bramhall*,—"They might as well say, that the Body and Blood of Christ becomes fusty and sour, as often as the species of bread and wine before their corruption become fusty and sour." [5]

[1] Ibid. Serm. 80. p. 821.
[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 80, 81.
[3] Ibid. p. 81; or, in the Treatise itself, c. xxii. *init.*
[4] Ibid. pp. 80, 81.
[5] See p. 871 above.

Dean Comber.

Another witness quoted in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, in support more particularly of his doctrine on the effect of consecration as making the real Body and Blood of Christ present in or under the forms of the bread and wine, was Dean Comber. And the passage on which this claim was founded was one quoted from the Dean in Bishop Mant's Comment on the Book of Common Prayer, on the rubric before the Prayer of Consecration, and is as follows:—

"We do not eat our common food, without first praying for a blessing on it; which pious custom is so universal, that it is certainly a piece of natural religion; how much more then are we obliged before we *eat and drink this bread and wine, which Christ designed to set forth the mystery of his death,* to consecrate it and set it apart by a solemn prayer; especially since Christ himself in the institution of this sacred ordinance, while he was teaching his Apostles how to celebrate it, did use a form of blessing over it, Matt. xxvi. 26; which St. Paul calls 'giving thanks,' 1 Cor. xi. 24. Wherefore all Churches in the world from the Apostles' days have used such a form, the ancient and essential part of which is the words of our Saviour's institution; for, since he makes this sacramental change, it hath been thought fit by all Churches to keep his own words, which being pronounced by a lawful priest, do properly make the consecration; wherefore our Church hath cut off all the later superstitious additions, by which the Roman Church hath corrupted this form, and given us a prayer of consecration, consisting only of the words of our Saviour's institution, and a proper prayer to introduce it. The first part is a prayer directed to 'Almighty God our heavenly Father,' commemorating his mercy in giving his Son to die for us, and the all-sufficient merit of his death, together with his command for our remembering it in this sacrament; and on these grounds desiring, that, since we obey him in thus celebrating it, we may therein receive Christ's Body and Blood. The second part is the repetition of the words and actions of our Lord at the institution, concerning both the time and the manner of its institution." [1]

For the sake of fairness I have given the whole of this pas-

[1] Mant's Book of Common Prayer, with Notes, &c. 5th ed. Lond. 1840. 4to. pp. 363, 364. Comber's Short Discourses upon the whole Common Prayer. Lond. 1684. 8vo. pp. 310, 311.

sage, but I am utterly unable to see in any part of it the slightest indication of doctrine favorable to Archdeacon Denison's views. That there is a "sacramental change" in the elements following their consecration, and that the faithful come to this ordinance, that they may "therein receive Christ's Body and Blood," no one denies. I am at a loss therefore to know, for what good reason the passage was referred to.

The doctrine of Dean Comber has been, I think, sufficiently shown in the passages given in the last chapter from his Exposition on the Catechism.[1]

But it fortunately happens, that Dean Comber has left a larger and fuller commentary on the Communion Service than that which is here quoted from;[2] in which his views are very clearly stated, and in which we have further evidence how little certain expressions, the use of which by some writers has been much insisted upon as showing their agreement with Archdeacon Denison's doctrine, can be depended upon as evidence of the doctrine maintained.

In this larger Commentary, interpreting the words, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c., in the Prayer of Consecration, he says,—

"It is very probable that our Lord did herein, as in other things, imitate that phrase which the Jews used at the Feast of the Passover, 'This is the bread of affliction, which our Fathers did eat,' &c., and, 'This is the body of the Paschal Lamb which our Fathers did eat,' &c. (as the Talmud Tract. de Pasch. declares). For as that was *not the very Bread, nor the very Lamb*, yet they *called it so*, because it did *represent* and *continue the memorial of* that, and was used to the same purpose; so, in like manner, *he calls this his own body, who was the true Paschal Lamb, because* THIS ACTION *doth signify and remember it, and by this* BREAD *we are partakers thereof.* Secondly, St. Paul, the best interpreter of his Master, expounds, 'This is my Body and Blood,' by, This is the 'communion of my Body and Blood,' (1 Cor. x. 16,) that is, most plainly, This blessed Bread is that which will make you partakers of Christ's Body, &c., and (1 Cor. xi. 26.) he calls it *no more but bread even after*

[1] See pp. 705, 706 above.

[2] A Companion to the Temple, or a help to devotion in the use of the Common Prayer.—The 4th ed. (from which I shall quote) was published Lond. 1701. fol.

the consecration. (vers. 24, 25.) And the same Apostle saith, 'That rock was Christ;' (1 Cor. x. 4;) not intending to make us believe the Rock was transubstantiate, but *only that it was the figure and symbol of Christ*, and so might be *called by his name.* Thirdly, Nor did the most ancient Fathers thus apprehend our Saviour's meaning, when they called this the antitype of his body, the type of a great mystery, the figure of his body, and a symbol called by the name of his body, and much more to this purpose..... Fifthly, It was long before Rome itself did determine this doctrine of *Christ's very flesh and blood being in the Sacrament.*" [1]

He then adds certain reasons against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, among which are the following, urged against it on the ground of its involving the doctrine of a real presence of Christ's Body and Blood such as is maintained by the Authors under review:—

"Because it is needless for us to expect to eat the natural flesh of Christ here, where we come to seek *a spiritual union with him by faith*, and an interest in his death; *to which the eating his flesh would nothing conduce.*..... And, further, since the heavens must contain Christ's body to the end of the world, it is impossible it should be *but one, and yet many, and in several places at once;* always whole, yet often broken; received entire by every person, and yet then at the right hand of God; existing before, yet created by the priest. We must deny our reason as well as our senses, if we can believe so great and absurd contradictions. Nor is it imaginable (if this were the intent of our Lord's words) how he who was then alive, and sitting at the Table, could break and give himself, or be eaten, and yet remain entire..... Yet still we do believe, that every duly disposed communicant doth receive really the Body and Blood of Christ, in and by these elements, but it is by faith and not by sense. *If we receive them in the manner and to the end which Christ appointed*, they give us a lively remembrance of his love and all-sufficient merit, and thereby invite our faith to embrace this crucified Redeemer, as the satisfaction for our sins; whereupon he (who is most ready to close with penitent sinners) doth by this rite of his own appointing, *give himself and the salutary benefits of his death unto such;* and although the manner be mysterious, yet the advantages are real, and the effect *more certain than if we eat or drank his natural flesh and blood.*" [2]

[1] These words, it will be observed, apply to the doctrine of the Real Presence alone, not to the particular *mode of it* by Transubstantiation.

[2] Companion to the Temple, pp. 539, 540.

With this passage before us, there can be no doubt as to his agreement or disagreement with the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison.

And continually throughout his Commentary he speaks in similar language, as for instance:—

"He that made him a sacrifice for us, will certainly make *these symbols* to communicate him to us, *if we be desirous and prepared to receive him.*" [1]

"We may with more confidence beseech him to sanctify these elements, that they may be his Body and Blood to us, because the divine appointment hath made them to be *the means whereby we may become partakers of the benefits of that holy passion.*" [2]

"We desire they may be made the Body and Blood of Christ to us; that although they remain in substance what they were, yet to the *worthy receiver* they may be something far more excellent, which nothing can effect but that Word which made all things out of nothing. . . . . We may cheerfully request, that *by the receiving this bread and wine* which he hath chosen, we may become 'partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood;' for St. Paul assures us, the Bread thus blessed is the communion or communication of Christ's body. There needs no real change in the substance of the elements, for this participation is not by sense, but by faith. This lively representation, by the operation of the Spirit, gives us a fresh remembrance of the love and merit of our Redeemer's passion, so that *by faith we lay hold upon him,* as the only satisfaction for our sins, and then the Power of God doth by *these symbols* communicate our Lord unto us, and *convey unto our souls all the salutary benefits of that great expiation.* We have all the real effects, the virtue and the comfort of receiving Jesus, though we do not tear his flesh with our teeth." [3]

"When we hear the most efficacious words of Christ pronounced, we must exercise our faith, and not only join our desires, that this wine may become the Blood of Christ, but with our hearts say, Amen. For *it is unto us according to our faith;* IF WE BELIEVE, *it is to us the Blood of Christ,* and that which makes us partakers of the benefits thereof." [4]

And he thus paraphrases a portion of the Prayer of Consecration:—

"He brake it (as we this bread) into many pieces, an emblem of his broken and wounded body, and gave it to his disciples, to whom

[1] Ibid. p. 534. [2] Ibid. p. 534. [3] Ibid. p. 536. [4] Ibid. p. 542.

he designed the benefits of his passion, saying, Take this pledge of your redemption most thankfully, and by faith eat, that you may be nourished by my love, for *this is the communion of my Body*, and shall make you partakers of it as it is a sacrifice which is given to God to satisfy for you, *provided you do this* in a most thankful remembrance of me and my all-sufficient oblation . . . . saying, Drink ye all who desire a part in me of this cup, and apply to yourselves the benefits of my blood-shedding, for *this is the communion of my blood* which sealeth the New Covenant," &c.[1]

Now, it is impossible to deny, that in these passages he maintains, that the Body itself of Christ, that is, the substance of the Body, is *not present to any one* in that sense in which Archdeacon Denison maintains it to be present, i. e., in or under the form of the bread, because he expressly says that it cannot be in divers places at one time; and that he limits the reception of the Body to the faithful and devout communicant.

But yet nevertheless we find him using the very phrase which was so much insisted upon in the case of Bishop Taylor and Dr. Sherlock; for he says, speaking of a wicked man:—

"He doth increase his sad portion, *by putting Christ's body into a filthy soul*, and taking the holy symbols into those receptacles of rage and anger, cruelty and revenge, which Jesus hates."[2]

But can there be a moment's doubt as to his meaning? Arguments raised from expressions like these, occurring in the midst of statements fully manifesting the writer's views, are (to speak far within the mark) puerile.

And so we may observe, that, just before that dogmatic statement we have quoted from him above, arguing the impossibility of the real presence on earth of the substance of Christ's Body, he says, in that sacramental language the true meaning of which, it might be supposed, would be fully understood by all well-instructed members of our Church,—

"Lest we should be mistaken, and either not understand or not believe the true worth of this incomparable gift, he is pleased to tell us what it is, 'This is my body,' saith he, which is given for you, and *by that word he makes it to be so to every true believer*."[3]

But we must go to *his own* statements, not to Romish works,

[1] Ibid. p. 544. [2] Ibid. p. 472. [3] Ibid. p. 539.

to know what sense is to be attached to the words, "makes it to be so."

Archbishop Tillotson.

Among other authors, the compiler of the *Catena* has had the courage to quote Archbishop Tillotson,[1] and the passage cited in the *Catena* was produced on the defence of Archdeacon Denison. A more decisive proof of the recklessness with which this evidence has been got up, could hardly be conceived; as any one acquainted with Archbishop Tillotson's works must be aware.

I will first give the passage quoted, as it stands in the *Catena*.

"I deny not but that the Fathers do, and that with great reason, very much magnify the wonderful mystery and efficacy of the Sacrament, and frequently speak of a great supernatural change made by the Divine benediction, which we also readily acknowledge."[2]

Now let us read *the very next words to these*:—

"They say, indeed, that the elements of bread and wine do by the Divine blessing become to us the Body and Blood of Christ: *but they likewise say*, that *the names of the things signified are given to the signs;* that the bread and wine do still remain in their proper nature and substance, and that they are turned into the substance of our bodies; that *the body of Christ in the sacrament is not his natural body, but the sign and figure of it;* not that body which was crucified, nor that blood which was shed upon the cross; and that it is impious to understand the eating of the flesh of the Son of man, and drinking his blood, literally."[3]

And in the context he proves, at large, that the words, "This is my body," &c., must be understood in a figurative sense, and says,—

"Nor do I believe that any sensible man who had never heard of Transubstantiation being grounded upon these words of our Saviour, 'This is my Body,' would upon reading the institution of the Sacrament in the Gospel ever have imagined any such thing to be meant by our Saviour in those words; *but would have understood his meaning to have been*, This bread signifies my body, This

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c Pt. i. p. 131.

[2] The reference is, "Disc. on Transubstantiation."

[3] Disc. against Transubst. Works, 10th ed. Lond. 1735. fol. vol. i. p. 233.

CUP SIGNIFIES MY BLOOD; and this which you see me now do, do ye hereafter for a memorial of me. But surely it would never have entered into any man's mind to have thought that our Saviour did literally *hold himself in his hand, and give away himself for himself with his own hands.*" [1]

"By the sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are said to communicate, or to be made partakers of the Body of Christ which was broken, and of his Blood, which was shed for us, THAT IS, *of the real benefits of his death and passion.*" [2] . . . .

"Besides, if we consider that he celebrated this sacrament before his passion, it is impossible these words should be understood literally of the natural Body and Blood of Christ; because it was his 'Body broken' and his 'Blood shed,' which he gave to his disciples, which if we understand literally of his natural Body broken and his Blood shed, then these words, 'This is my body which is broken, and This is my blood which is shed,' could not be true, because his body was then whole and unbroken, and his blood not then shed." [3]

And, in the latter end of the discourse, meeting the argument for a change in the elements from its necessity "to the comfort and benefit of those who receive it," he shows that "there is no colour" in it, and adds,—

"So that if we could do so odd and strange a thing as to eat the very natural flesh and drink the blood of our Lord, I do not see of what greater advantage it would be to us, than what we may have by partaking of *the symbols* of his Body and Blood, as he hath appointed, in remembrance of him. For the spiritual efficacy of the sacrament doth not depend upon the nature of the thing received, supposing we receive what our Lord appointed, and receive it with a right preparation and disposition of mind, but upon *the supernatural blessing that goes along with it*, and makes it effectual to those spiritual ends for which it was appointed." [4]

Bishop Bull.

Another witness quoted in the *Catena* [5] and in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, is Bishop Bull; and the evidence given for this reference is the following passage:—

[1] Ibid. p. 231. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. p. 232. [4] Ibid. p. 240.
[5] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. p. 120.

"We are not ignorant that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the bread and wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the consecration of them, do become and are made the Body and Blood of Christ. But we know also, that though they do not all explain themselves in the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant from the doctrine of transubstantiation." [1]

All depends here, as before, on *the way* in which the elements are supposed to "become and be made the Body and Blood of Christ." And *the very next sentence* shows, that the views of Bishop Bull were entirely different from those of Archdeacon Denison, for the next words are these:—

"Some of the most ancient doctors of the Church, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, seem to have had this notion, that by or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the *Spirit of Christ, or a divine virtue from Christ descends upon the elements, and* ACCOMPANIES THEM TO ALL WORTHY COMMUNICANTS, and that *therefore* they are said to be, and are, the Body and Blood of Christ; the same divinity which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in heaven being virtually united to the elements of bread and wine on earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies, in which it is prayed, 'that God would send down his Spirit upon the bread and wine in the Eucharist.' And this doubtless is the meaning of Origen in his 8th book against Celsus," &c. . . . . "And Origen expressly saith, 'that what we eat in the Eucharist is bread, but bread sanctified and made holy by prayer, and which, *by the divine virtue that* ACCOMPANIES *it*, sanctifieth all those who worthily receive it.' "

This doctrine is entirely different from that of the Archdeacon, and, whether it is the most correct view or not, (for that is a point on which I have no wish now to enter,) gives no countenance to his contradiction of the Articles of our Church. It is the view advocated by Grabe in his Notes on Justin Martyr and Irenæus, to whom indeed Bishop Bull refers on the point.

But further; in the page next preceding that quoted in the *Catena*, Bishop Bull, interpreting the words, "This is my body *which is given for you*," "*broken for you*," &c., says,—

"Now whatsoever our Saviour said was undoubtedly true: but

[1] Corruptions of the Church of Rome in Answer to Bossuet. Works, ed. Oxf. 1816. vol. ii. p. 255.

these words could not be true in a proper sense; for our Saviour's body was not then given or broken, but whole and inviolate; nor was there one drop of his blood yet shed. THE WORDS THEREFORE MUST NECESSARILY BE UNDERSTOOD IN A FIGURATIVE SENSE."

And he adds,—

"It [the Eucharistical sacrifice] was then [i. e. in the ancient Church] believed to be an *ἀνάμνησις*, or *commemoration*, by the *symbols of bread and wine*, of the body and blood of Christ, once offered up to God on the cross for our redemption; it could not therefore be then thought an offering up again to God of *the very body and blood of Christ substantially present under the appearance of bread and wine;* for these two notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together." [1]

And again, in a previous page, he says,—

"In the holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God *the bread and wine as 'figures or images of the precious blood of Christ shed for us, and of his precious body,'* (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy,) and plead to God the merit of his Son's sacrifice," &c.[2]

And therefore all the change that he acknowledges in the elements themselves is, as he elsewhere expresses it, that they are "changed in use," [3] as having become sacred symbols of the body and blood of Christ, effectual through the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit for bringing the believer into spiritual communion with that body and blood.

BISHOP KEN.

The claim put forward for Bishop Ken's sanction to the doctrine here controverted I have already partly considered,[4] and have shown the nature of the quotations made for that purpose from his Exposition of the Catechism. As far therefore as that work is concerned, I shall content myself here with referring the reader to what I have there stated, merely adding, that, in the

[1] Ibid. p. 254. [2] Ibid. p. 252.
[3] Vindic. of Ch. of Engl. in letter to Lady Newburgh. Wks. ii. p. 221.
[4] See pp. 706—710 above.

defence of Archdeacon Denison, the misquotation given in the *Catena* was repeated, and not the slightest notice taken of the important alteration made by Bishop Ken in the revised edition of his Exposition; in which, instead of the words "art present on the altar"—the only words that gave any appearance of support to Archdeacon Denison's doctrine—he himself substituted the words, "art present throughout the whole sacramental action *to every devout receiver*."

In the second part of the *Catena*[1] other extracts from his works are given, taken from his "Manual of Prayers for the use of the Scholars of Winchester College," and his Poetical works.

With respect to the latter, it is so obvious that the language of poetry is an utterly unsuitable test of a man's doctrine on the question now at issue, that I do not think it worth while to raise an argument upon them one way or the other. The extracts from the "Manual" prove nothing but his belief in the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ "in the Holy Sacrament."

But the mere use of this phrase does not touch the point in question. We must know *the sense* in which he used the words, before we can determine his agreement or disagreement with the Authors under review. And just as in his Exposition of the Catechism, he limits the reception of "*both* parts of the sacrament" to those who "*with due preparation*" receive "the signs,"[2] so here he does the same, clearly representing the bread and wine, not as things which are so conjoined to the body and blood of Christ that the reception of one is the reception of the other, but as things which are instrumental by God's promise for the communication of Christ's Body and Blood to faithful recipients. For the sentence that follows those quoted is this:—

"Lord, I believe that the bread that we break, and the cup that we drink, are not bare signs only, but the real communication of thy body and thy blood, and pledges to assure me of it; and I verily believe, that *if with due preparation* I come to the altar, as certainly as I receive the outward signs, so certainly shall I receive the thing signified, even thy most blessed Body and Blood."[3]

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Part ii. pp. 25, 26.
[2] See p. 709 above.
[3] Manual, &c. Lond. 1675. 12mo. p. 43.

And his subsequent language shows, that he considers that those who do receive the Body and Blood of Christ are thus mystically united to Christ, which cannot be the case with the unfaithful; for he says,—

"Glory be to thee, O Lord, who by this heavenly food dost mystically unite us to thyself; for nothing becomes one with our bodies more than the bodily food we eat, which turns into our very substance, and nothing makes us become one with thee more than when thou vouchsafest to become the very food of our souls." [1]

Unfortunately we have no *dogmatic* work of Bishop Ken's, giving more definite statements of doctrine on the point in question. But it is worth notice, that in a pamphlet published by a Roman Catholic in the time of James II., containing animadversions on a sermon preached by him,[2] he is called to account for preaching "with much vehemency, against the Real Presence." [3]

The writer complains,—

"I saw you exhorted with passion your 'people not to be tottered by every blast of wind, that shall say, Christ is on this altar, or Christ is on that altar, for Christ is *actually in heaven, and shall continue there till he comes to judge at the end of the world.*' As for this point, I answer first, that if your Lordship means to persuade your poor people, that he is not really present on your own Communion Tables, you may swear it confidently, and so may I too; for I own no power in you to bring him, nor intention to make use of any power to possess his most sacred humanity really in your Communion bread; and it is our Roman Catholic doctrine, that without characterical power and lawful intention he cannot be really present on our altars, and much less on your Tables." [4]

And he proceeds to argue in favor of the real presence of Christ's Body on earth in the Eucharist in refutation of the Bishop's statements in his sermon to a contrary effect, and urges,—

"Do not, I pray, fool your poor people any more with the feigned impossibility of believing, that so proper a man as Jesus Christ is or can be in a little wafer. Speak, my Lord, like a Christian

[1] Ibid. p. 47.

[2] Animadversions by way of answer to a Sermon preached by Dr. Thomas Kenne, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, in the Cathedral Church of Bath, on Ascension Day last, May 5, 1687. Lond. 1687. 4to.

[3] Animadversions &c. p. 9.

[4] Ibid.

scholar, and own that these four glorious qualities just now mentioned, [i. e. "agility, subtility, clarity, and impassibility] do dispense with the Body of Christ's local possessing of a place *cum extensione partium supra partes*. It is true, that, living as a mortal man on earth, he took his dimensions corporally as other mortal men do, though then itself he might have done it spiritually as often as he pleased, which was once only, viz. *pridie quam pateretur*, that is, the day before he suffered. You must therefore confess under pain of eternal damnation, that our sweet Redeemer's body is no more subject to time or place." [1]

"I prove now that you taught in that Ascension sermon a doctrine quite repugnant to your own Bible. Here are the words of St. Luke, 22nd. chap. 19th verse, 'This is my body which is given for you.' What can be more plain? Notwithstanding your Lordship must needs maintain, *that what Christ gave, and his Apostles received, was nothing else but bread and wine.*" [2]

"Now, my Lord, I will urge one instance more against *your communion by faith only*, and thus I proceed. Either your Lordship's soul in your actual communion ascendeth to heaven, there to feed on Christ by faith, or else Christ descendeth to feed your soul. What to this, my Lord? You cannot allow the first, for so your unglorified soul should be in two places at once, *which you deny even to the very glorified soul and body of Christ. You do not allow the second, for so Christ should be in two places at once*, and if in two, why not in an hundred, and an hundred thousand? For the one is no more difficult to God's absolute power than the other. This *you do not allow;* for once granted, the rest could not be denied. I would fain then know, what you are at in your sacramental communion, for I do not find any third way your Lordship can feed in truth and really on Christ's body in your sacrament," &c. &c. [3]

And being so accustomed to give an unorthodox interpretation to phrases implying a true reception of Christ's Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper that he could not understand them in any other sense, he accuses Bishop Ken of contradicting in his sermon the expressions he had made use of in his Exposition of the Catechism.

He says,—

"I shall beg of your Lordship once more to deal sincerely, and tell me your own opinion of the Protestant Communion. I know full well what you say in the Exposition of your Catechism printed

[1] Ib. p. 12. [2] Ibid. p. 14. [3] Ibid. pp. 15, 16.

for Charles Brome, anno 1686. That I know, and will soon bring down your very words, which are *quite opposited to what I heard you preach the last Ascension-day.* But tell me once more, I pray, your meaning in this particular. For my part I want day to find you out, for I see your sermon contradicts your writings, *non es ergo tibi constans*, i. e. you are not constant to yourself. For now you receive Christ's flesh and blood virtually, now figuratively, another time spiritually by faith, and in [the] Exposition of your Catechism you contradict all that in teaching the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ to be *verily and indeed taken by* the faithful in our Lord's Supper."

And then, having quoted a passage from the "Exposition," he adds,—

"These are your own words, my Lord, catholic enough on the paper, but *quite contrary to what you teach in the pulpit*, for there you say, 'That the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is verily and indeed taken by the faithful;' and here you say *not at all*, but sometimes one way, and sometimes another; spiritually to-day, by faith only; and virtually to-morrow, and in your Catechism you write, 'indeed and verily.'" [1]

Now from these statements it is perfectly clear what was the doctrine maintained by Bishop Ken in the sermon referred to; a sermon preached not long after his Exposition of the Catechism was published. And the difficulty which this Romanist found in reconciling the two, evidently arose merely from his taking the words of our Catechism, and the Bishop's Exposition of it, in *the Romish sense.* That a man can partake verily and indeed of our Blessed Saviour's Body and Blood, is with the Romanists and the Authors under review utterly impossible, unless that Body and Blood form a compound with the elements, and are thus swallowed with them. That the true and real reception of that Body and Blood is altogether a spiritual act, an act of the soul, externally represented by the reception of the bread and wine into the Body, the Body and Blood of Christ being given by God to *the faithful* communicant, as the bread and wine are given by man to *all* the communicants, is a notion which is too much opposed to sacerdotal presumption to be received with the slightest favor.

[1] Ibid. pp. 16, 17

Dean Brevint.

In the passages quoted from Dean Brevint in the *Catena*,[1] and repeated thence in the defence of Archdeacon Denison, there is nothing to afford the slightest support to the doctrine of the Authors under review. Throughout the whole of the treatise, Dr. Brevint gives no higher description of the consecrated elements, than that of signs instrumental in communicating to the *worthy* recipient, through the Divine blessing accompanying their use, the Body and Blood of Christ.

The real views of Dr. Brevint will be best shown by some other extracts from the same treatise from which the passages in the *Catena* are given.

"The blessed Communion . . . being of its own nature a sacrament, *that is, a sign of an invisible grace*, it must principally stand to signify, and lead us to, greater blessings."[2]

"What we take and eat is made of a substance cut, bruised, and put to the fire—that shows my Saviour's passion."[3]

"Hitherto we have considered this holy sacrament, first, as a standing memorial of that passion wherein Christ Jesus once offered himself up to God as a sacrifice; and secondly, as a sign of that nutritive and corroborative grace (the true efflux of that sacrifice) *by which sign he daily offers himself to us under the notion of meat.* 'For his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed.' (John vi. 55.) And I ingenuously confess, that the most general use of the blessed Communion runs upon these two notions, and that these two main resemblances between the bread and Christ's body, which qualify the consecrated bread (and the consecrated wine in the same manner) to bear the character of a sacrament, do *likewise sufficiently qualify it to bear another honour which it enjoys, of being* CALLED *the Lord's Body*. However, it is most certain, that when the Fathers call it so, (which Christ himself taught them to do,) *they justify both his and their speech upon the account of resemblance*, and of this commerce (most usual between representations and objects represented) of interchanging their own names. (Read the 23rd Epistle of St. Austin ad Bonif.) So, for example, in the prophetic visions and dreams, which most commonly

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. pp. 27—33.

[2] The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice. [First printed Oxf. 1679. 12mo.] Oxf. 1847. 8vo. Sect. iii. § 1. p. 16.

[3] Ibid. § 11. p. 25.

were nothing else than extemporary sacraments of things then revealed by God; those are most commonly said to be these:— The seven ears of corn *are seven years*.... Now it is certain that no visions nor images have ever been more intended for this end of *representing* than the true sacraments have been; therefore it were most unreasonable to think, that these sacred images should want that privilege which all other (although casual and profane) are allowed to have, viz., *to take the name of their objects*. Nay, since the paschal lamb, the circumcision, and the baptism have it, (for one is called the *passover*, the other the *covenant*, and the other the *burial* of Christ,) *why should the holy Communion be without it?* Besides, *it is not conceivable that Christ, who had yet in his hands that paschal bread which was called by the Jews the 'bread of affliction which their fathers did eat in Egypt,' because it was the memorial of it, may not be understood after the same manner, when, a moment after, he calls it his body.*" [1]

Here, then, we see the reason he assigns for *the consecrated thing* being called the Lord's Body. It is not from there being any real presence of the substance of Christ's body in or under it, but from the *sign being called by the name of the thing signified*. And he expressly maintains, that "*the literal and immediate sense of these words, 'This is my body,' comes to no more.*" [2]

Justly, however, does he add, that "the end of the blessed "Communion, the exigency and pious desire of communicants, "and the strength of other places of Scripture, require a great "deal more in the Eucharist than a mere memorial or repre-"sentation;" [3] and this further use is, to be instrumental in the communication of the Body and Blood of Christ.

What, then, does he consider to be implied in this communication of Christ's body and blood? Does he hold it to be by the real presence of Christ's body and blood on earth in or under the elements? Far from it. Thus he describes it:—

"I know as much of this bread, that it is not such a jewel as may contain in its substance, or impart from itself to others, grace, holiness, and salvation, which is the juice and the substance of Christ's body. Only I am perfectly satisfied, that it is the constant way of God to produce his greatest works *at the presence*

[1] Ibid. Sect. iv. §§ 1, 2. pp. 28—30. [2] Ibid. § 3. p. 30. [3] Ibid.

(*though not by the virtue*) *of the most useless instruments.* At the very stroke of a rod, he parted once in two the Red Sea. At the blowing some trumpets, he tumbled down massy strong walls. At some few washings in Jordan, he cured Naaman of a plague which naturally was incurable; and as soon as but a shadow did pass by, or some oil was dropped down, or some clothes were touched, presently virtue went out, not of rods, or trumpets, or shade, or clothes, but *of himself.* 'Virtue,' says he, 'is gone out of me,'—and thus he cured the sick, &c. Since, then, he hath instituted and adopted unto himself the sacraments of the Gospel as *the representatives of his sacred body and blood,* why may he not take the same course for the dispensing of his mercies at the use of his ordinances? and why should not his very body pour out effusions of life, as well when we take in his sacraments, as when others did touch his clothes, which surely had less privilege? . . . . Under the Gospel it is *Christ himself, with his body and blood once offered to God upon the cross, and ever since standing before him in heaven as the Lamb slain* (Rev. v. 6.), who fills his Church continually with the propitiations and perfumes of his sacrifice, when, after the receiving of the holy sacrament, faithful communicants return home richer than they came, with the first fruits of salvation. . . . In this manner, faithful communicants *eat as effectually of the body of Jesus Christ by receiving its strength and virtue,* as the saints eat of the tree of life, (Rev. xxii. 2,) because they eat *the fruit of that tree;* or Israel did drink of the rock, (1 Cor. x. 4,) because they did drink of *the stream that flowed from it.* Once my Saviour could say, that somebody had touched him, *though they had touched but his clothes,* because a woman had reached both her faith and her hand so near as to be healed by the divine warmth and virtue that proceeded then out of him, *as if she had touched his very flesh.* THE TRUTH IS, WE REALLY TOUCH, HAVE, OR ENJOY THE THING ITSELF, WHEN WE ARE WITHIN THAT DISTANCE WHERE WE MAY ENJOY ITS VIRTUE. So the Church was clothed with the sun (Rev. xii. 1), because she had all about her its brightness; and by the holy baptism we are said to put on Christ (Gal. iii. 27), because we then receive the robes of his righteousness, and that which was typified by that garment which God made of skins (which implies the death of victims) to cover Adam's nakedness. This victim having been offered up both in the fulness of time and in the midst of the habitable world, which properly is Christ's great temple, and thence being *carried up to heaven,* which

is his proper sanctuary, THENCE *he spreads all about us salvation*, as the burnt offering did its smoke, as the golden altar did its perfumes, and as the burning candlestick its lights. *And thus Christ's body and blood have* EVERYWHERE, *but especially at the holy Communion, a most true and real presence.* When he offered himself upon earth, the vapour of his atonement went up and darkened the very sun; and by rending the great veil, it clearly shewed he had made a way into heaven. Now since he is gone up to heaven, *thence he sends down* on earth the graces that spring continually, both from his everlasting sacrifice, and from the continual intercessions which attend it. So that it is in vain to say, Who will go up into heaven? since, *without either ascending or descending, this sacred body of Jesus fills with atonement and blessing the remotest parts of this temple.*" [1]

From this passage the doctrine of Dean Brevint is clear. The body and blood of Christ have "a most true and real presence" on earth, but this presence is not a presence of their substance on the Communion-table, but a presence of spiritual influence and operation, by which they are truly and really present to the spirit of the faithful communicant, and placed in union and communion with him. The last part of the above passage is one of the extracts in the *Catena;* given, I suppose, on account of its using *the words,* "real presence." With what propriety it has been thus quoted, the reader may now judge.

"The first use of this sacrament is, to set out as new and fresh the great and holy sufferings which have purchased our title to everlasting happiness; the second is, both to represent the quality, and to afford us the help, of all necessary graces (true effluxes of these sufferings) to capacitate us towards it; and the third is, to assure us, that when we are capacitated by these graces, God and his Christ will faithfully surrender to us the purchase itself, that is, eternal happiness. And these three parts put together make up the proper and true sense of these words, 'Take and eat, this is my body;' for the consecrated bread is not said to be the Lord's body *only because* it represents the Lord's body, but because also, *as to our present use on earth,* it DOTH AS GOOD as exhibit it: and as to our happiness in heaven, bought with the price of this body, it is the most solemn instrument to assure our title to it. Thus, the consecrated elements are no more the body and blood of Christ in

[1] Ibid. Sect. iv. §§ 8—11. pp. 35—38.

that sense that pictures and maps set about rooms are commonly called kings and countries, *only because they represent them;*—but *as patents also* granted by kings, or other deeds and evidences left in our houses by our ancestors, *are called lands, estates, and manors,* because they convey over to us most really both the title and possession of all the goods which they mention. Represent to your mind Jacob dividing among his children every parcel of his estate, and withal *surrendering the titles that belong to each division;*—Take thou this, Joseph, *this is the field* which my grandfather Abraham bought of Hephron; and you, Manasseh, come you hither, *this is the land* which I got from the Amorite. It is most certain, that the surrendering such instruments (although in themselves but papers or parchments) is in very deed nothing less than giving away the very lands: and deeds and lands may very well go together under one name, since by giving, whether deeds or lands, whether patents or privileges, fathers and other benefactors do both intend and effect the same thing." [1]

Hence we see he had no more notion of an actual junction of the body and blood of Christ to the bread and wine, than of an actual junction of land to the title-deed which gave it away.

These passages are all taken from the same treatise from which the extracts in the *Catena* are made; and none of those extracts contain anything inconsistent with these passages. The passage quoted to sanction Archdeacon Denison's doctrine as to the adoration of Christ as present under the forms of the bread and wine, not only contains nothing to support it, but uses language of a contrary kind. For, all it says about adoration, is of the adoration of Christ while the sacraments are being celebrated, and its language is, "I will not fail . . . . to worship also my Saviour *whom those sacraments do represent.*" [2]

Our divines are careful to maintain, especially in their controversies with Rome, that Christ is to be worshipped in the sacramental rite, and as being, though on his throne in heaven, present with us there; but not to be worshipped as in or under the forms of the bread and wine, *which would direct our worship to the elements.* And it is one of the inevitable difficulties arising from the double meaning of words used with reference to this rite, that sometimes the phrase

[1] Ibid. Sect. v. § 8. pp. 47, 48.

[2] Ibid. Sect. ii. § 6. p. 11.

"*worshipping Christ in the sacrament*" has been used; meaning, in the sacramental rite. And from such ambiguous phraseology the Authors under review have derived their apparent (and only apparent) support from our divines. But as to the true *character* of such a reference, when the meaning of an author is clear from his own statements, there can be no difference of opinion among those who are seeking to know the truth.

There is another work of Dean Brevint, entitled, "The Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," in which the opposition of his doctrine to that of the Authors under review is perhaps still more clearly seen. A few extracts may be desirable.

"This is the plain and literal construction, which we make of Christ's words, (Matt. xxvi. 26, &c.,) Jesus took bread, true substantial bread; and blessed it, that is, both with prayer and thanksgiving he consecrated this bread, and made it a holy sacrament; and brake, and gave it, &c., that is, after he had broken in pieces, and distributed among his disciples, this same bread by him blessed and consecrated, he bids them to eat it in that proper and real manner that bread can be eaten, telling them withal, that this bread which he hath thus taken, blessed, broken, and given them to eat, was his body in as real and elevated manner of being as a great and holy sacrament can be *said to be* the very thing which it hath been instituted to *represent and exhibit*. So that the sacred Eucharistical act of receiving this holy sacrament *with faith and contrition*, must not be less accounted of than the very real communion of Christ's body. All this is both said and done literally and really, without scarce so much as one figure. For the particle 'is,' as the best Roman Catholics will sometimes acknowledge (Janson. Liturg. l. iv. c. 8.), including all manner of beings, whether substantial or accidental, whether of quality, or cause, or effect, or relation, &c., common sense and reason can teach any man to choose either this or that, (and no other,) which he sees to be proper to the condition of the subject he hath in hand. So when Christ says, that God is a Spirit, it is evidently so by a being of substance. When he says of himself, that he is the resurrection, it is by a causal being. When St. Paul says the rock was Christ, it is a being of similitude. Thus when here he says, that the bread, which he took, blessed, and gave, was his body, it is confessed on all hands, that the bread cannot be Christ's body by a substantial

being, or that the substance of that bread cannot be the body of Christ; *therefore here 'is' must be understood of some other kind of being that is suitable to the matter in question.* Now, the matter Christ there speaks of, is a true *representing sacrament*, namely, the consecrated bread: and a represented truth, namely, the true natural body of Christ. Where 'that' must needs be said *to be* 'this,' *by a being of* SIMILITUDE, or, as Jansonius calls it, (supr.,) *a similitudinary being, that is, a being of resemblance.* But if you please to call it a figure, as most of our Reformed Churches do; first, it is but one; secondly, one as plain and intelligible as God ever was pleased to make use of in the institution of all his other most solemn sacraments. The Paschal Lamb is the Passage, Exod. xii. The circumcision is the Covenant, Gen. xvii. 10. This cup is the New Testament, &c., Luke xxii.," &c.[1]

"That which is substantial bread, is not substantially the Lord's body; but that which Christ hath in his hand, and gives to his disciples, when he says, 'this,' is true substantial bread; therefore it cannot be substantially the Lord's body, *but by resemblance only.*"[2]

"The body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament in the same way and manner as they are broken and shed. Now, the body and blood of Christ are not broken and shed in the sacrament *really* (otherwise transubstantiation would kill Christ), but *in a sacramental representation only.*"[3]

"The two elements of bread and wine, being set apart and consecrated, and then, by an ordinary manner of speech, *called the Body and Blood of Christ.*"[4]

Comparing Melchizedek's supply of bread and wine to Abraham with the Eucharist, he says,—

"Thirdly, compare this bread and wine under this second notion, that is, a kind of refreshment offered by Melchizedek to Abraham, with the bread and wine of the Holy Communion, which Christ hath ordained for his Church; in this comparison, that cannot be said properly to have been a shadow to represent this; since *both this and that are but shadows of something more substantial than themselves;* and, in good severe divinity, shadows are not instituted to represent shadows, although being they are much like one another, because *both represent but the same truth,* in this sense

[1] Missale Romanum; or, the Depth and Mystery of Roman Mass. [First printed Oxf. 1672. 12mo.] Oxf. 1847. 8vo. c. xiii. pp. 281—283.
[2] Ibid. p. 293. [3] Ibid. pp. 298, 299. [4] Ibid. c. vi. p. 155.

one may be said to be the figure of the other; and holy Fathers say so sometimes. But, however, they are *two figures, or sacraments*, agreeing together like *two images, to represent one and the same original*." [1]

"These men believe, at least they teach, that the natural body of Christ, being still as entire and as big, as either it was upon the cross, or as it is now in heaven, lies hidden under the figure and within the quantity of small wafers; and that, these being consecrated, it may be on thousand altars, and, every one of them bruised into as many pieces, the said body both is entire and whole in every one of them, and for all this is one in all. This is it which they call to be *under the sacramental forms*." [2]

And on the question of worship, he says,—

"The last refuge of Roman Catholics is to defend themselves by pleading good intention, and say they directly worship *what is contained in this wafer*, because they take it for their Saviour. So might they plead who worshipped the sun and moon," &c.[3]

I had marked many other similar passages for quotation, but these are surely more than sufficient for our purpose.

Rev. Herbert Thorndike.

If the question at issue in this work were to be decided by the mere use of certain phrases, understood in the sense which the Authors under review attach to them, there can be no doubt that the testimony of Thorndike would be in favor of Archdeacon Denison's doctrine. For he says that "the elements are really changed, translated, turned and converted into the Body and Blood of Christ," though this change is "not destructive to the bodily substance of the elements, but cumulative of them with the spiritual grace of Christ's Body and Blood," and, of course, that the wicked receiving the elements so changed receive what he calls the Body and Blood of Christ. But yet, nevertheless, the presence of Christ's real body and blood no man holds less than Thorndike. The case of Thorndike is another striking proof how little, in the subject under discussion, we can depend upon the mere use of certain words and phrases as evidence of an author's real views.

[1] Ibid. c. xi. p. 212. [2] Ibid. c. iv. p. 139. [3] Ibid. c. viii. p. 198.

His meaning he himself shall explain in his own words; and I will quote first from the same work from which the extracts in the *Catena* are taken.[1]

"If the Church only pray, that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ, *so that they which received them may be filled with the grace of his Spirit;* then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements in their bodily substance; because, supposing that they remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit, *to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than his flesh and blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth.* AND THAT, I SUPPOSE, IS REASON ENOUGH TO CALL IT THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST SACRAMENTALLY, that is to say, as in the sacrament of the Eucharist."[2]

This passage *immediately precedes* one of the extracts given in the *Catena*.

And if the reader thinks that there is any obscurity in this passage, as to Thorndike's precise view of the way in which the consecrated elements become the Body and Blood of Christ, he will find none, I think, in the following passage, taken from one of Thorndike's works, published only three years after this;[3] where, speaking of the *consecration* of the elements, he says,—

"Now it is executed, and hath always been executed, by the act of the Church, upon God's word of institution, praying, that the Holy Ghost, coming down upon the present elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ. Not by changing them into the nature of flesh and blood, as the bread and wine that nourished our Lord Christ on earth, became the flesh and blood of the Son of God, by becoming the flesh and blood of his manhood, hypostatically united to his Godhead, saith St. Gregory Nyssene; but, IMMEDIATELY AND IPSO FACTO, BY BEING UNITED TO THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST, THAT IS, HIS GODHEAD. FOR, THE FLESH AND BLOOD OF CHRIST BY INCARNATION, THE ELEMENTS BY CONSECRATION, BEING UNITED TO THE SPIRIT, THAT IS, THE GODHEAD OF CHRIST,

[1] An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England. Lond. 1659. fol. The quotations are from the third book of this work, entitled, "The Laws of the Church."

[2] Epilogue, &c. bk. 3. Of the Laws of the Church c. 4. p. 30.

[3] Just Weights and Measures. Lond. 1662. 4to.

BECOME BOTH ONE SACRAMENTALLY, BY BEING BOTH ONE WITH THE SPIRIT, OR GODHEAD OF CHRIST, TO THE CONVEYING OF GOD'S SPIRIT TO A CHRISTIAN." [1]

So that, after all, Thorndike means nothing less than the presence of the real body and blood of Christ. And all the apparently stringent passages quoted in the *Catena* in favor of such a presence, merely mean, that the Holy Spirit, being united to the elements, and also united to the flesh and blood of Christ, the flesh and blood and the elements are in a sense one, and thus a *sacramental body and blood* of Christ come into existence.

And Thorndike proceeds specially to condemn the errors both of transubstantiation and *consubstantiation*. For, after speaking in praise of the doctrine he advocates, he says,—

"It condemns the error of Transubstantiation, making the change mystical and immediate, upon the coming of God's Spirit to the elements; the nature of them remaining. But *it condemns Consubstantiation for no less. For, what needs the flesh and blood of Christ fill the same dimensions, which the substance of the elements possesseth*, BOTH BEING UNITED WITH HIS SPIRIT? And truly they that invite the Lutherans to their communion, professing consubstantiation, must not make transubstantiation an error in the foundation of faith, if they will weigh by their own weights and mete by their own measures." [2]

And in the work first quoted, he expressly and formally opposes the notion that the real body of Christ can be present on earth in or under the sacramental elements. He says,—

"But, seeing the flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at God's right hand, though, by his sitting down at God's right hand, we understand the man Christ to be put into the exercise of that divine power and command which his Mediator's office requires, yet *his body we must understand to be* CONFINED *to that place where the Majesty of God appears to those that attend upon his throne.* Neither shall the appearing of Christ to St. Paul, Acts xxiii. 11. be any exception to this appointment."

And, having argued the question of the appearance to St. Paul, he adds,—

"This is all the argument I pretend to maintain upon this con-

[1] Just Weights, &c. p. 94. [2] Ibid. p. 95.

sideration: knowing well enough, that it is said indeed, that the flesh of Christ remaining in heaven in the proper dimensions thereof, which the Exaltation allows, nothing hinders the same to be present under the dimensions of the elements, whether the substance of them be there, which consubstantiation allows, or whether they be abolished, as transubstantiation requires. Which he that would contradict, must enter here into a philosophical dispute, whether or no the infinite power of God can bring to pass either or neither of these effects; That is to say, whether it imply a contradiction, that the body and blood of Christ (*which is as sure in heaven as the faith of Christ is sure*) should at the same time be present in the sacrament of the Eucharist, under the dimensions of the elements, whether we suppose the substance of them to be abolished, or to remain present. This dispute I am resolved not to touch at this time: partly for that reason which I have alleged upon other occasions; because I desire to discharge this book, being written in our mother tongue, of all philosophical disputes, tending rather to puzzle than to edify the main of those that speak English; partly, for a reason peculiar to this point, because it hath been argued, that, if we deny transubstantiation or consubstantiation as contradictory to reason, there can be no cause why we should cleave to the faith of the Trinity, which every man sees to be no less contradictory to human reason than either of them both. For, *though I do noways admit this consequence, because it is evident, that the nature of bodily substance is far better comprehended by man's understanding, than the incomprehensible nature of God*, which it is impossible to apprehend anything of, but under the resemblance of something belonging to sensible substance, yet I am willing to go to issue, without drawing this dispute into consequence, *referring to judgment, whether the evidence for consubstantiation or transubstantiation be such as for the Holy Trinity out of the Scriptures.* That is to say, whether the presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist is so to be understood, as to void the confining of them to those dimensions which the Scripture allows them in heaven; (*and this as necessarily by the Scripture as the Scripture necessarily obligeth to believe the Holy Trinity;*) when as it *may be, more properly to the nature of the business, understood mystically, as in a sacrament, intended to convey the communion of his Spirit.*" [1]

And now I think that both Archdeacon Denison and Dr.

[1] Epilogue, &c. bk. 3. Of the Laws of the Church, c. 3. p. 22.

Pusey [1] will be willing enough to repudiate any sympathy with Thorndike's doctrine of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. But how they can reconcile it to their consciences to quote authors in this way, I am at a loss to understand.

The passages I have quoted from the work from which they give their extracts are in *close proximity* to those extracts, and clearly show their meaning; but they are carefully passed over, and their author is quoted in defence of views which he has expressly repudiated, by means of an interpretation of his language in other places in a sense opposed to his *declared* meaning.

I need hardly say that I am no advocate for the orthodoxy of Thorndike's doctrine, but it certainly affords no support to that of the Authors under review.

Archdeacon Yardley.

Another witness cited in the *Catena* [2] which Archdeacon Denison has adopted for his defence, and also, I believe, (though not with reference to the same passage,) in the course of his defence in the trial at Bath, is Archdeacon Yardley.

The passage cited in the *Catena* stands thus:—

"After the consecration of the elements immediately follow the reception and distribution of them, which continue still in their natural substance of bread and wine, though they are changed in their value and efficacy into the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ." [3]

In these words there is nothing to which I am inclined to take any exception. All will admit, that the elements become, on their being solemnly set apart for the purposes of the Eucharist, the "*sacramental* Body and Blood of Christ."

[1] Dr. Pusey gives special prominence to the passage of Thorndike referred to p. 904 above, as supporting his views. See his Sermon, p. 36.

[2] Doctr. of Real Pres. &c. Pt ii. p. 78.

[3] Mant's Book of Common Prayer. This is the only reference given in the *Catena*. The passage is from his work entitled, "A Practical Exposition on the Offices of Baptism and Confirmation, and on the Communion Service," &c. Lond. 1763. 12mo. p. 102.

And the same remark applies to another passage, (which was, I *think*, quoted from Mant's Notes on the Book of Common Prayer[1] on the trial, but which at any rate it is well to notice,) in which Archdeacon Yardley says, that "the virtue of those words, [i.e. "This is my body" &c.,] once spoken by Christ, doth still operate towards *making the bread and wine his body and blood.*" [2]

The question is, in what *way* Archdeacon Yardley supposed them to become so, and we shall find, that, whether we agree with him in his precise view or not, he was far enough from holding Archdeacon Denison's doctrine. For he holds no real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in or under the elements, but only, that the elements themselves are made Christ's Body and Blood "*in virtue and effect,*" "endued with a quickening and life-giving power." Thus he speaks on the Prayer of Consecration ;—

"We pass in the second place to petition God the Father, that he would hear us of his mercy, and make the bread and wine lying before him the Body and Blood of his Son ;—not by the perishing of their substance and substitution of a new ;—not by a change of their nature ;—NOT BY ANY CONCOMITANCY OR ANNEXING OF THE SUBSTANCE OF CHRIST'S NATURAL FLESH AND BLOOD TO THE BREAD AND WINE ;—but his Body and Blood *in virtue and effect*, his *sacramental Body and Blood*, endued with a quickening and life-giving power. But as this must be the work of God ; as the elements cannot be changed, even as to their *effects*, but by the operation of his Holy Spirit, it becomes necessary for us to make our addresses to God, that he would exert his power to make them the Body and Blood of Christ : and this we do when we beg that we, *receiving the elements*, 'may be partakers of his Body and Blood.'" [3]

"The Communicant is reminded . . . . that, whilst with his mouth he eats the holy bread, he should feed on Christ in his heart by faith ; not fixing his attention solely upon the external sign, the sacramental Body ; but lifting up his soul to heaven, where alone Christ sitteth in his glorious Body at the right hand of God, in that Body which was crucified for him, THE SYMBOL AND TYPE OF WHICH *he is now to take and eat*, and, by faith in Christ, to make himself partaker of the blessed effects of his sufferings." [4]

[1] p. 364.
[2] Practical Exposition, &c. p. 101.
[3] Ibid. pp. 98, 99.
[4] Ibid. p. 107.

"It [the Post-Communion Prayer] begins with a hearty acknowledgment of God's goodness in feeding those with the spiritual food of our Lord's most precious Body and Blood, *i. e. in making them partakers of the benefits purchased by his death*, who have duly received the sacramental Body and Blood."[1]

"Our Church suffers not even the Holy Sacrament itself to be adored, though it be *the typical and symbolical Body and Blood of Christ*."[2]

It will be observed, that the doctrine of the Authors under review is *formally, and in express terms, repudiated;* and the only point in which I should differ from Archdeacon Yardley is in those expressions which seem to indicate that a heavenly virtue is imparted to the bread and wine themselves. That there is a presence of the blessed influence of Christ's Body *with them* so as to *accompany their reception* in the case of every *faithful* communicant, I maintain; and this, I believe, is all that Archdeacon Yardley, and several others who have spoken in similar terms, meant when they used such language as that just quoted; because they frequently use the same terms respecting the water of baptism.

Archbishop Wake.

In support of Archdeacon Denison's dogma, that the effect of consecration is, to make the real Body and Blood of Christ present in or under the forms of the bread and wine, Archbishop Wake was quoted. The reader who recollects the extracts already given in a former part of this work from the Archbishop's Exposition on the Catechism,[3] will probably be surprised to see his name so used. For, as I have there observed, the statements in those extracts subvert the very foundations on which the doctrine of the Authors under review rests.

But it would seem, that no amount of opposition to the doctrine impugned, no statements however clear, unambiguous, and earnest in contradiction to that doctrine, will prevent an author being quoted in defence of it, if only a few words can be caught up, even from a part of a sentence, (as is the case in the present instance,) which, standing alone, can induce a reader to

[1] Ibid. p. 111. [2] Ibid. p. 116. [3] See pp. 711—713 above.

think, that the writer of them favored the doctrine of the Authors under review.

The treatise of Archbishop Wake here referred to[1] was written for the express purpose of proving, that *that* doctrine of the Real Presence which is advocated by the Authors under review is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

The words cited were these, namely, that "the bread and wine, after consecration, are the real, but the spiritual and mystical, body of Christ."[2]

Now, in the first place, he who is responsible for this citation was in such haste when he noted it, that he has overlooked the fact, that the words are *not* those of Archbishop Wake, but occur in a quotation by the Archbishop from Bishop Stillingfleet. And, *in this very quotation, the previous sentence stands thus:—*

"ALL WHICH THE DOCTRINE OF OUR CHURCH IMPLIES BY THIS PHRASE [i. e. the Real Presence], IS ONLY A REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S INVISIBLE POWER AND GRACE, SO IN AND WITH THE ELEMENTS, AS BY THE FAITHFUL RECEIVING OF THEM TO CONVEY SPIRITUAL AND REAL EFFECTS TO THE SOULS OF MEN."[3]

Such are the words of the previous sentence to that in which the statement cited in defence of Archdeacon Denison occurs! And here, therefore, we have the testimony of another of our celebrated divines, and one of the most learned and able that our Church has produced, in opposition to the doctrine here controverted. His testimony on one essential part of that doctrine has been already quoted in a previous page.[4]

And on *the very same page* on which the Archbishop gives this quotation from Stillingfleet, undertaking "to state the notion of the Real Presence, as acknowledged by the Church of England," he writes thus:—

"I must observe, 1st. That our Church utterly denies our Saviour's Body to be so really present in the Blessed Sacrament, as either

[1] A Discourse of the Holy Eucharist in the two great points of the Real Presence and the Adoration of the Host. Lond. 1687. 4to.

[2] Discourse, &c., p. 44.

[3] Ibid. Quoted from Stillingfleet's Answer to J. G.'s Dialogues. Lond. 1679. p. 66.

[4] See pp. 165—168 above.

to leave heaven, *or to exist in several places at the same time.* We confess with this Author,[1] that it would be *no less a contradiction for Christ's natural body to be in several places at the same time by any other mode whatsoever than by that which the Church of Rome has stated;* THE REPUGNANCY BEING IN THE THING ITSELF, AND NOT IN THE MANNER OF IT. 2ndly. That we deny, that, in the sacred elements which we receive, there is *any other substance than that of bread and wine, distributed to the communicants;* which *alone* they take into their mouths and press with their teeth."[2]

And then, having given the quotation from Bishop Stillingfleet, he adds,—

"Thus has that learned man, to whom J. G. first made this objection, stated the notion of the Real Presence professed by us; and that this is indeed the true doctrine of the Church of England in this matter, is evident not only from the plain words of our XXVIIIth Article, and of our Church Catechism, but also from the whole tenor of that Office which we use in the celebration of it."

He then gives some quotations from that "Office," and remarks,—

"All which, and many other the like expressions, clearly show, that the Real Presence which we confess in this holy Eucharist is no other than, in St. Paul's phrase, a real communion of Christ's Body and Blood; or, as our Church expresses it, Article XXVIII., 'That to such as rightly and worthily and with faith receive the same, the *Bread* which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ."[3]

To quote, therefore, Archbishop Wake in defence of the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison, is something worse than a mistake.

In fact, the reference to this treatise of Archbishop Wake is the most unfortunate reference that Archdeacon Denison could have made; for this very treatise includes *an express reply to the Archdeacon's argument from the writings of our divines.* It was written during the celebrated controversy with the Romanists

[1] He is alluding to Abraham Woodhead, in reply to whom he was writing; a gentleman who was living secretly at Hoxton, propagating anonymously Romish doctrine, while receiving the pay of a Fellow of a College in Oxford.

[2] Ibid. p. 44. [3] Ibid. pp. 44, 45.

in the time of James II., in reply to one of the treatises of the above-mentioned Abraham Woodhead. And it is a remarkable fact, that the Romish champion thought, that the views of his Church could be best advanced among us by the attempt to prove, that some of our own chief divines, though repudiating Transubstantiation, had taught the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood on earth in the Sacrament, and the adoration of them as there present; and his witnesses are just *the chief of those whom the compiler of the Catena and Archdeacon Denison have cited for the same purpose.* And Archbishop Wake here replies to this statement, and devotes a considerable portion of the treatise to an investigation of it: observing,— "For our own authors, I shall insist the rather upon them, "both to take off any impression which *the scraps here put* "*together by those* WHOSE BUSINESS IT IS TO REPRESENT THEIR "OWN SENSE, NOT THEIR AUTHOR'S, might otherwise be apt to "make upon some men; and also to show the exact concord "there has been, ever since the Reformation, amongst us, as to "this matter."[1]

The doctrine of the Real Presence which he imputed to some of the chief divines of our Church was, that "the very substance of Christ's body" "is present, as in heaven, so here in this holy sacrament, either to the worthy receiver or to the symbols," [i. e., as he elsewhere explains it, *not "ad modum corporis,* or *with the ordinary properties of a body,"* but after a spiritual and supernatural mode of existence,] which is precisely the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison, who in fact insists upon its presence "to the symbols." This doctrine, says Archbishop Wake, "not "only contradicts the present declaration of our Church, viz., "'That the natural body of Christ is not in this blessed sacra-"ment,' but will also lay a necessity upon us to quit our reason "too that we give for it; viz., 'That it is against the truth of a "natural body to be in more places than one at one time;' and "on which we seem to found our faith in this matter."[2]

In proof of his position, Woodhead quotes from Hooker, Bishop Andrewes, Casaubon, Bishops Hall, Montagu, Bilson, Laud, Jeremy Taylor, and Forbes, and Mr. Thorndike. And

[1] Discourse, &c., p. 52. [2] Discourse, &c., p. 42.

with respect to all these the Archbishop, after pointing out their real testimony on the subject, concludes:—

"And thus have I considered the several divines produced for this new conceit concerning the Real Presence, and shown the greatest part of his authors to be evidently against it; some not to have spoken so clearly that we can determine anything concerning them, but *not one that favors what they were alleged for;* viz., to show that they believed Christ's natural body to be both in Heaven and in the sacrament, only after another *manner* than the Papists." [1]

And on the *character* of the attempt to palm this doctrine upon the divines referred to, he thus speaks:—

"He has dealt with Mr. Hooker just as himself, or one of his friends, has been observed to have done on the like occasion with the incomparable Chillingworth; has *picked up a passage or two that seemed for his purpose, but dissembled whole pages in the same place that were evidently against him.*" [2]

"For Bishop Taylor *I cannot acquit our author of a wilful prevarication;* since it is evident that he has *so plainly opposed his notion,* and that in the very book he quotes, and which he wrote on purpose to show our meaning of the Real Presence, that *he could not but have known that he misrepresented him.*"

And then, having given some of the passages I have already quoted from Bishop Taylor, the Archbishop adds:—

"Such is the account which that excellent Bishop here gives not only of his own, but, as he expressly terms it, of the Church of England's, and the generality of the Protestants', belief in this matter. *Our author's dissimulation of it is so much the more inexcusable,* by how much the more zealous an advocate he makes him of his cause, when all this I have transcribed was in the very same section, and almost in the same page, with what he has cited." [3]

The Archbishop proceeds to give another extract, (one of those already given above,) and then adds the following paragraph, which, as it includes an important extract from Bishop Taylor, not given in the preceding pages, I will here insert at length:—

"If this does not yet satisfy him, that he has injured this learned man in the representation of his opinion, *directly contrary to his*

[1] Ibid. p. 71. [2] Ibid. p. 61. [3] Ibid. p. 67.

sense, I will offer him yet one passage more, taken from another part of his Works, and which I hope will thoroughly convince him. It is in the 5th Letter to a Gentleman that was tempted to the communion of the Church of Rome. He had proposed to the Bishop this question, 'Whether, without all danger of superstition or idolatry, we may not render Divine worship to our Blessed Saviour, as present in the blessed sacrament or host, according to his human nature, in that host?' The question is certainly every way pertinent to our present purpose; let us see what the answer is that he makes to it. 'We may not render Divine worship to him as present in the blessed sacrament according to his human nature, without danger of idolatry, because he is not there according to his human nature, and therefore you give Divine worship to a *non-ens*, which must needs be idolatry.' Well, but still it may be, the Bishop does not intend to exclude the *corpus Domini*, but only the *corporal* or *natural manner* of that Body. Let us therefore hear how he goes on. 'For *idolum nihil est in mundo*, saith St. Paul, and Christ, as present by his human nature in the sacrament, is a *non-ens*. For *it is not true;* there is no such thing.' What, not as Christ there, no way as to his human nature?—No, 'he is,' saith the Bishop, '*present there by his Divine power, and his Divine blessing, and the fruits of his Body, the real effective consequents of his passion;* but for any other presence, it is *idolum;* it is nothing in the world. ADORE CHRIST IN HEAVEN; FOR THE HEAVEN MUST CONTAIN HIM TILL THE TIME OF RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.' *This, then, is Bishop Taylor's notion of the Real Presence; and now I am confident our author himself will remit him to the company of those old Zuinglian bishops, Cranmer, Ridley, and the rest*, who lived before that Q. Elizabeth had propugned the Real Presence of his new model into the heads of the governors of the Church of England."[1]

I may be permitted to express a hope, that the Authors under review may do the same, and allow Bishop Taylor at least to take that place he must, according to their view, so richly have earned for himself among Zuinglian heretics.

The Archbishop having disposed of Woodhead's citations on the question of the *Real Presence*, proceeds to those on the subject of *the adoration of Christ* as so present, on which Woodhead had quoted Bishops Andrewes, Taylor, and Forbes, the Archbishop of Spalato, and Thorndike; the two former of whom

[1] Ibid. pp. 68, 69.

Archbishop Wake shows to have been most unfairly cited on the point, and of the last three very justly observes:—

"As for Bishop Forbes and the Archbishop of Spalato, it is not to be wondered, if men that had entertained the design of reconciling all parties, were forced to strain sometimes a little farther than was fit for the doing of it. And for Mr. Thorndyke, we have seen that his notion of the Real Presence was particular, and widely different both from theirs and ours; and therefore that we are not to answer for the consequences of it. But, however, to quit these just exceptions against them, [and he might have added that the two former did not belong to the Church of England, and were not bound by her Articles,] will he himself allow everything to be the doctrine or not of the Church of Rome, which I shall bring him three of their authors to affirm or deny? If he will, then Transubstantiation is not their doctrine, for I have already quoted above twice three of their most learned men against it." [1]

I might add much more from Archbishop Wake, but if I have not quoted enough, more would be equally thrown away.

Now I put it to the reader, whether misquotation could be carried to a more extreme point, a more fearful climax, than is reached in this case. Here is a treatise written to prove, that such a doctrine of the Real Presence as that advocated by Archdeacon Denison is irreconcilable with the Formularies of our Church, and specially to manifest the injustice and dishonesty of an attempt to show, that it has been maintained by some of our esteemed divines. And yet a few words of this very treatise are quoted, in a solemn inquiry in a Court of Law, as sanctioning Archdeacon Denison's doctrine, and its author is made to figure in a list of witnesses in its favor, including those whom he had in this treatise himself vindicated from the charge of maintaining it!

The Archbishop has spoken with just indignation of the treatment awarded to Bishop Taylor and others by the writer to whom he was replying. But what would have been his feelings, could he have foreseen, that even *his Answer* was to be one day quoted to prove *him* a maintainer of the doctrine which he is there labouring to show, both they and the Church of England repudiated?

[1] Ibid. pp. 90, 91.

Such is the way in which Mr. Newman's doctrine as to the claims of truth is being acted out among us!

I have now gone through the whole list of divines quoted on the trial of Archdeacon Denison as sanctioning his doctrine, with the exception of three living authors, *Dr. Hampden, Bishop of Hereford, Mr. Palmer, and Mr. Brown,* from whose writings, as quoted in the *Catena,*[1] passages were read in defence of the Archdeacon's statements. And I think it will be generally felt, that living authors are not the most suitable witnesses in such an investigation. What we have to ascertain, as it respects the witness of writers, is, what was the doctrine which was held and taught by the great body of our divines in *former times* from the period of the Reformation. In any case like that of Archdeacon Denison, the theology of the period in which it occurs is certainly not a desirable test by which to try it. I shall not therefore attempt to constitute the writers thus referred to, however able and respectable, as witnesses on the question before us, but only remark that their words do not justify the reference thus made to them.

It was alleged that *the Bishop of Hereford* says, that "both parties [i.e. the Church of England and the Church of Rome] affirm, that Christ is really and truly present in the Eucharist; both affirm that a change is worked on the bread and wine by consecration, so that they are verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ."[2] Perfectly true, but the next words are, "But on one side *it is denied, that this reality and truth is to be sought in the bread and wine;* . . . . on the other side [i.e. the Romish] it is contended, that this reality and truth of the Divine presence must be in the consecrated elements themselves, or otherwise they are mere signs without any latent virtue."[3] And this *latter notion,* that is, the Romish, is just that of Archdeacon Denison. And again, the Bishop of Hereford (as quoted in the *Catena* itself) says,—"It is a real and true presence that he, Ratramn, asserts: *the virtue of Christ acting in the way of efficacious assistance to the receiver of the sacrament.* The Church of England doctrine of the sacraments, it is well known, is founded on the

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 149, 156—165, and 165—168.
[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. p. 149. [3] Ibid.

views given by this author." Precisely so; the "true and real presence" of the Church of England is, "*the virtue of Christ acting in the way of efficacious assistance to the receiver of the sacrament.*" Let Archdeacon Denison preach this doctrine, and no one will interfere with him.

Again, in defence of Archdeacon Denison's maintenance of the doctrine that the wicked eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, it was urged, that *Mr. Palmer* says, that the opinion "that the wicked eat not the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist," "is taught by the Church of England as the more pious and probable opinion, not as a matter of faith necessary to be believed by all men, for this would amount to a condemnation, not only of the Roman Churches, but of the Lutherans, as heretical, which has never been the doctrine of this Church." [1]

I will only say, that I entirely agree with Mr. Palmer in this view of the matter, and should be very sorry to see such a point placed by any Church among the articles of faith *necessary to be believed by all men.* But the only question before us is, whether the Church of England does teach the doctrine; because, if so, her ministers are bound to teach it, and, at any rate, not to contradict and oppose it; and that this is the case, Mr. Palmer expressly affirms in this very place; and in another part of the same work still more plainly, remarking that our Church "holds, that such a faith is 'the means by which the body of Christ is received and eaten,' . . . . the essential qualification on our parts, *without which that body is not received,*" and that "sinners" "only partake of the bread and wine." [2]

From *Mr. Brown* the only extract offered was this;—"In one sense of the words we may admit, that every communicant eats Christ's body and drinks his blood." [3] But unfortunately for the object for which the quotation was made, if any one goes to the work from which this passage was cited, he will find *the very next words* to be these,—"BECAUSE *he eats the symbol which is called his Body* (*corpus, h. e. figura corporis*),

[1] Doctr. of Real Pres., &c. Pt. i. pp. 160, 161. The passage is from Mr. Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. ii. p. 263. 2nd ed.; 197, 198. 3rd ed.

[2] Treat. on the Church. Pt. ii. ch. 7. i. 404. 3rd ed.

[3] Doctr. of Real Pres., &c. Pt. i. p. 166. The extract is from the Rev. Harold Brown's Exposition of the Articles. 2nd ed. 1854. p. 729.

and drinks the symbol which is called his blood." And Mr. Brown's exposition of the XXVIIIth and XXIXth Articles are so entirely opposed to the whole doctrine of the Archdeacon upon the subject, that, to give the passages that show this, would require the whole to be given.

Here, then, I think I might fairly stop in this inquiry into the doctrine of our divines, having examined the testimony of *all those* who were produced as witnesses on the trial of Archdeacon Denison, and who must of course be considered to be the best that could be produced. But as various other divines have been quoted in the *Catena*, whose testimony it is, for one reason or another, desirable to examine, I shall, in order to complete the investigation, continue it so as to include all that are of importance among the remaining referees, and, in fact, comprehend in the examination almost the whole list.

The witness of *Bishop Burnet* has been already considered,[1] and therefore I add no more respecting his testimony.

I will take first—

Bishop Bayly.

The extracts from Bishop Bayly in the *Catena*[2] are made precisely in the same way as the rest; a few passages being selected in which certain ambiguous phrases occur; the context, which shows the meaning in which those phrases are used, being carefully kept out of sight.

The following passages will show Bishop Bayly's real views.

"The parts of this blessed sacrament are three. First, The earthly signs signifying. Secondly, The Divine word sanctifying. Thirdly, The heavenly graces signified. First, The earthly signs are bread and wine, in number two, but one in use. Secondly, The Divine word is the word of Christ's institution; pronounced with prayers and blessings by a lawful minister. The bread and wine without the word are nothing, but as they were before; but when the word cometh to those elements, then they are made a sacrament; and God is present with his own ordinance, and ready to perform whatsoever he doth promise. The Divine words of blessing

[1] See pp. 670—676; and 717, 718 above.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. pp. 23, 24.

do not change or annihilate the substance of the bread and wine: (for if their substance did not remain, it could be no sacrament:) but it *changeth them in use and in name.* For, that which was before but common bread and wine to nourish men's bodies, is after the blessing destinated to an holy use, for the feeding of the souls of Christians. And where before they were called but bread and wine, they are now *called by the name* of those holy things which they *signify*, The body and blood of Christ; *the better to draw our minds from those outward elements to the heavenly graces,* which, by the sight of our bodies, they *represent to the spiritual eyes of our faith. Neither did Christ direct these words, This is my body, This is my blood, to the bread and wine; but to his disciples;* as appears by the words going before, Take ye, Eat ye. *Neither is the bread his body, but in the same sense that the Cup is the New Testament, viz., by a sacramental metonymie.* And Mark notes plainly, that the words, 'This is my blood,' &c., were not pronounced by our Saviour, till after that all his disciples had drunk of the cup. (Mark xiv. 23, 24.) And afterwards, in respect of the natural substance thereof, he calls that *the fruit of the vine,* which in respect of the spiritual *signification* thereof he had before termed *his blood,* verse 25, *after the manner of terming all sacraments.* And Christ bids us *not to make him,* but to do this in remembrance of him; and he bids us eat not simply his body, but his body *as it was then broken,* and his blood *shed:* which S. Paul expounds to be but the 'communion of Christ's body,' and the 'communion of his blood,' *that is, an effectual pledge that we are partakers of Christ, and of all the merits of his body and blood. . . .* Thirdly, The spiritual graces are likewise two; the Body of Christ, as it was, with the feeling of God's anger due to us, crucified; and his Blood, as it was (in the like sort) shed for the remission of their sins. They are also in number two, but in use one; viz., whole Christ, with all his benefits offered to all, and *given indeed to the faithful.* These are the three integral parts of this blessed sacrament, the sign, the word, and *the grace.* The sign without the word, or the word without the sign, can do nothing: and both conjoined are unprofitable without *the grace signified:* but all three concurring make an effectual sacrament to a *worthy*[1] receiver. SOME RECEIVE THE OUTWARD SIGN WITHOUT THE SPIRITUAL GRACE, AS JUDAS, WHO (AS AUSTIN SAITH) RECEIVED THE BREAD OF THE LORD, BUT NOT THE BREAD WHICH WAS THE LORD. Some

[1] These are his own italics.

receive the spiritual grace without the outward sign, as the saint-thief on the cross; and innumerable of the faithful, who dying desire it, but cannot receive it through some external impediments: but *the worthy receivers to their comfort receive both in the Lord's Supper. . . . The outward signs the pastor gives in the Church, and thou dost eat with the mouth of thy body; the spiritual grace Christ reacheth from heaven, and thou must eat it with the mouth of thy faith.*" [1]

From this passage, which occurs within a few pages of that quoted in the *Catena*, the doctrine of Bishop Bayly is plain. And I shall now proceed to give the context of the principal passage quoted in the *Catena*, inserting that passage in its place; and when the reader sees it *with its context*, he will be able to judge of the propriety of the citation. He is describing "the fourth end of the Lord's Supper," and he says,—

"To feed the souls of the faithful in the assured hope of life everlasting. For this sacrament is a sign and pledge unto as many as shall receive the same according to Christ's institution, that he will according to his promise, by the virtue of his *crucified* body and blood, as verily feed our souls to life eternal, as our bodies are by bread and wine nourished to this temporal life. And [2] to this end Christ, *in the action of the sacrament*,[3] really giveth his very body and blood to every *faithful* receiver. Therefore the sacrament is called the 'communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord.' (1 Cor. x. 16.) And communication is not of things *absent*, but *present:* neither were it the Lord's Supper, if the Lord's Body and Blood were not there. Christ is verily present in the sacrament, by a double union:[4] whereof *the first is spiritual*, 'TWIXT CHRIST AND THE WORTHY RECEIVER; the second is sacramental, 'twixt the Body and Blood of Christ and the outward signs in the sacrament. The former is wrought by means that *the same Holy Spirit, dwelling in Christ and in the faithful, incorporateth the faithful, as members unto Christ their Head*, and so makes them

[1] The Practice of Piety.—I quote from the edition printed Lond. 1685. 8vo. pp. 356—60. Bishop Bayly was made Bishop of Bangor in 1616, and died in 1631.

[2] The quotation in the *Catena* begins here.

[3] Not in or under the forms of the bread and wine, but "in the action of the sacrament."

[4] Here the extract in the *Catena* stops, the very next words showing the nature of the presence supposed not to be such as the extract was quoted to support.

one with Christ, and partakers of all the graces, holiness, and eternal glory, which is in him: as sure and as verily as they hear the words of the promise, and are partakers of *the outward signs of the holy sacrament.* Hence it is, that the will of Christ is a true Christian's will: and the Christian's life is Christ, who liveth in him. (Gal. ii. 20.) If[1] you look to the things that are united, this union is essential: if to the truth of this union, it is real: if to the manner how it is wrought, it is spiritual. It is not our faith that makes the Body and Blood of Christ to be present, BUT THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST DWELLING IN HIM AND US. Our faith doth but receive and apply unto our souls those heavenly graces which are offered in the sacrament. The other, being the sacramental union, is not a physical *or local*, but a spiritual conjunction of the earthly signs, which are bread and wine, with the heavenly graces, which are the Body and Blood of Christ, IN THE ACT OF RECEIVING, *as if* by *a mutual relation* they were but one and the same thing. Hence it is, that in the same instant of time that the *worthy* receiver *eateth with his mouth the bread and wine of the Lord,* he eateth also *with the mouth of his faith* the very Body and Blood of Christ. Not that Christ is brought down from heaven to the sacrament, but that *the Holy Spirit by the sacrament lifts up* his mind unto Christ; not by any local mutation, but *by a devout affection:* so that in the holy *contemplation of faith* he is at that present with Christ, and Christ with him. And thus believing and meditating how Christ his body was crucified, and his precious blood shed for the remission of his sins, and the reconciliation of his soul unto God, his soul is hereby more effectually fed in the assurance of eternal life, than bread and wine can nourish his body to this temporal life. There must be, therefore, of necessity in the sacrament both the outward signs to be visibly seen with the eyes of the body, and the Body and Blood of Christ, to be spiritually discerned with the eye of faith. But the form, *how the Holy Ghost makes the Body of Christ, being* ABSENT FROM US IN PLACE, *to be present with us* BY OUR UNION, Saint Paul terms a great mystery, such as our understanding cannot worthily comprehend. The[2] sacramental bread and wine, therefore, are not bare signifying signs, but such as wherewith Christ doth indeed exhibit and give to every *worthy receiver* not only his Divine virtue and efficacy, but also his very Body and Blood, as verily as he gave to his disciples the Holy Ghost, by the sign of his sacred breath, or health to the diseased by the word of his mouth, or touch of his hand or garment.

[1] This sentence is added in the *Catena*, but *not what follows it.*

[2] This sentence down to "Blood" is also given in the *Catena.*

And the *apprehension by faith is more forcible than the exquisitest comprehension of sense or reason.*" [1]

I need not, surely, stop to point out, that this passage as a whole is precisely in accordance with the former extract, and is altogether consonant to the doctrine maintained in this work.

Throughout these passages the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ is *limited* to the *worthy* communicant, and the presence of that Body and Blood to such a communicant is supposed to be precisely of the kind for which I contend.

Dr. Christopher Sutton.

In the case of Dr. Sutton, it is only necessary to compare his language in the context of the passages quoted in the *Catena* [2] to see that his doctrine is totally different from that of the Authors under review. For thus he writes:—

"Whereas every question in a case of faith, godly and devout reader, ought to stand forth at the tribunal of Holy Writ, and there to be judged: let it not seem strange unto any, if as once Paul appealed unto Cæsar, so we by course allowable in Law, do (evermore due respect had unto the authority of the ancient Fathers) in the first place, and that by good right, make our appeals in cases of controversy unto the Holy Scriptures. For why? In these we not only find the truth safe and sound, notwithstanding all the devices of evil men, endeavouring to corrupt the same, yet ever the same, and so confirmed by the consent of the Church, but also the means of seeking out of the same truth, which if we follow as the best guide, we cannot slip, err, or be deceived. .... And here, first, *let the devout Christian call to mind, that he that said of the bread,* '*This is my body,*' *and of the wine,* '*This is my blood,*' *said also of S. John the Baptist,* '*This is that Elias,*' *and of himself,* '*I am the door,*' '*the true vine,*' &c. These, 'Receive my covenant in your flesh:' 'By baptism we are buried with him:' 'Being many, we are one bread, one body,' are usual phrases in the Scriptures." [3]

[1] Ibid. pp. 368—372.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Part i. pp. 30—32.

[3] Godly Meditations upon the most holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ch. 70. §§ 1, 3. pp. 343, 347. ed. Lond. 1613. 12mo.

In these words Dr. Sutton recognises in the clearest way the *figurative* character of the words, "This is my body," &c.

And he proceeds as follows:—

"Again, what more meet than a spiritual food to admit a spiritual sense? We did all eat of the same spiritual meat, saith the Apostle, 1 Cor. x. 3. Was it not given after supper, and in small quantity? It is the Spirit, it is the Spirit that giveth life. I go forward, but by the way this pious consideration gathered out of the words of Christ, concerning Christ's own institution, doth easily show this to be the nourishment of our souls, which is delivered in the Lord's Supper, and doth withal manifest the great excellency thereof. From the words of Christ I come unto the Apostle S. Paul, a good interpreter of the same words, one who wanted not care of stirring up the Corinthians to reverence and devotion about this mystery. Now what saith the Apostle? *He commands no adoration:* he speaks not a word of transubstantiation, but only shows the dignity thereof in showing both the author and end." [1]

He then proceeds to "the orthodoxal Fathers," and points out his agreement with them, and intimates clearly in the following words, that *the only change* they admitted in the elements was "of their use," observing,—

"They admit a change, but what a one? Of the substance? Nothing less, for it remains the same. *Of the use?* It is right; for sure in the Lord's Supper it is divine." [2]

Again, he says,—

"Truly we give, and that justly, great respect and reverence to the Holy Eucharist: for whereas bread and wine are elements naturally ordained for the sustentation of the body, *by the power of Divine benediction, they do receive a virtue, that being received of the faithful, they become nourishments of the soul;* nay, they become means whereby we are crucified both in body and soul, and are made the members of Christ." [3]

Now these words certainly might be taken to imply, that he held, that a divine virtue is imparted to the *elements themselves;* but that is a notion not now under discussion. They clearly negative the idea of the real Body and Blood being *themselves* in or under the elements.

[1] Ibid § 4. pp. 347, 348. [2] Ib. § 7. p. 351.
[3] Ibid. § 11. pp. 352, 353.

And in the words that immediately follow, Dr. Sutton again illustrates the meaning of the words, "This is my body," in a way which shows that he considered them to be spoken *figuratively;* for he says,—

"But Christ, some say, in express words calleth the bread his body, and the wine his blood. True; *in express words also he calleth himself a rock.*"[1]

Dr. Sutton then goes on to speak of there being nevertheless a presence of Christ there; and it is very probable that he meant a presence by the impartation of virtue to the elements; but still even then he says, *that the unbelievers "eat not,"* for his words (as quoted in the *Catena* itself) are,—

"Is it not a hard saying, 'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of God,' &c. It is a hard saying to them that are hard of believing. The disciples hearing that of their Lord and Master, 'Take, eat, this is my Body,' they take, they eat, asking no question. Being confirmed in faith, saith Saint Chrysostom, they take and eat: unbelievers hearing [*misprinted,* having] the same of our Saviour, they depart, *they eat not.* Peter answereth, 'Lord, thou hast the words of life;' others go backward, leaving the Lord of life. The Capernite hearing, dreameth of eating naturally, grossly; *the godly are assured of eating spiritually, and yet withal really.*"[2]

Again, that his notion of the presence was only of the kind to which I have above alluded, may be concluded from the following passage, also given in the *Catena* itself:—

"Albeit, then, the manner be not of us over-curiously inquired or searched, yet the same presence of Christ is acknowledged which Christ himself would have acknowledged. We say with S. Ambrose, that there is not taken from bread the substance of bread, but *that there is adjoined the grace of Christ's body after a manner ineffable.*"[3]

When, therefore, Dr. Sutton says, "Consider the divine wis-" dom of the Son of God, who respecting our weakness hath "conveyed unto us his body and blood after a divine and "spiritual manner, under the forms of bread and wine,"[4] his words must be interpreted consistently with the statements he

[1] Ibid. § 12. p. 353.
[2] Ibid. § 13. p. 354.
[3] Ibid. § 32. p. 367.
[4] Ibid. ch. 4. p. 33.

makes in the context. John Fox himself admits, that these words, "under the forms of bread and wine," may be interpreted in an orthodox sense, and therefore, however objectionable their use may be, we must not affirm, that their use *necessarily* implies unsound views. We must, in short, judge of an author's real views by his statements taken *as a whole.*

Dr. Henry Hammond.

The extracts from Dr. Hammond in the *Catena*[1] are so illustrative of its real character, that, as they are very short, I shall give them entire. They are taken from his "Practical Catechism," and are as follows:—

"As verily as I eat the bread in my mouth, so verily God in heaven bestows on me, communicates to me, the Body of the crucified Saviour."

"Our adversaries are sometimes compelled by the force of truth to clear the Church of England from the imputation of disbelieving the sublime mysteries of this Holy Sacrament, and reducing it to a common spiritual exercise, in which the mind of the individual derives edification, and perhaps grace, from the contemplation and remembrance of an absent Redeemer's sufferings."

The reader will observe, that these extracts are given to prove, that Dr. Hammond held (to use the language of the "Advertisement to Pt. II." of the *Catena*) the doctrine of a "Real "Objective Presence of Christ's Body in the Holy Eucharist, "wrought by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the act of "consecration, and equally independent of the intention of the "priest, or the faith of the recipient."

Now, even without going further, we may observe as to these extracts themselves, that the first intimates, that the Body of Christ is *not* bestowed by the minister with the bread, but directly from "God in heaven," and that the second passage is altogether useless.

Moreover, in the very *same section* of the *same book* from which these extracts are taken, Dr. Hammond writes thus:—

Explaining the meaning of the words, "This is my body," he says,—

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. p. 38.

"Not that the bread was his body and the wine his blood in strict speaking, for he was then in his body when he so spake, and when the disciples distributed it among themselves, he was not bodily in every of their mouths. And *now his Body is in heaven, and there to be contained till the day of 'restitution of all things.'*"

And he points out that "many contradictions and barbarisms" would follow from a contrary supposition; and then he proceeds to state the "sense" that "must be put upon" the words, "This is my body," which he thus states:—

"In answering this question, I shall first give you an observation taken from the Jewish phrases and customs used in this matter: and it is this, That the Lamb that was drest in the Paschal Supper, and set upon the Table, was wont to be called the Body of the Passover, or the Body of the Paschal Lamb; and that Christ seems to allude to this phrase when he saith, 'This is my Body;' as if he should say, 'The Paschal Lamb and the Body of it (i. e. the presentation of that on the Table in the Jewish feast) the memorial of deliverance out of Egypt, and type of my delivering myself to die for you, I will now have abrogated, and by this bread which I now deliver to you, I give or exhibit to you this other Passover, my own self, who am to be sacrificed (my Body which shall presently be delivered to death) for you, that you may hereafter (instead of that other) retain and continue to posterity a memorial and symbol of me.' This for the words, 'my Body:' but then for the whole phrase, or form of speech, 'This is my Body,' it seems to be answerable to (and substituted instead of) the Paschal form—'This is the Bread of Affliction, which our fathers ate in Egypt,' or, 'This is the unleavened bread,' &c., or, 'This is the Passover:' *not that it is that very identical bread which they then ate*, but that it is the celebration of that anniversary feast which was then instituted, as when in ordinary speech we say on Good Friday, and Easter-day, This day Christ died, and this day Christ rose, when we know that it was so many hundred years since he died or rose: which example is adapted to this point in hand by St. Austin in his Epistles. Thus much for the phrase or form of speech; now for the sense or full importance of the words, 'This is my Body,' I shall by the authority of the ancient Fathers think myself obliged to acknowledge, that the highest sense, that will not be subject to those intolerable inconveniences mentioned in the answer to your last question, may possibly be the sense of them; and that that which most belongs to other places of Scripture, speaking of the

same matter, must in any reason be resolved to be the sense of them. For the former of these, it is certain that many of the ancient Fathers of the Church conceived very high things of this sacrament, acknowledged the bread and wine to be changed and to become other than they were: but not so as to be transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ, to depart from their own substance, or figure, or form, or to cease to be bread and wine; and that *the faithful* do receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, (which implies *not any corporal presence of Christ on the Table, or in the elements, but God's communicating the crucified Saviour*—WHO IS IN HEAVEN BODILY AND NOWHERE ELSE—*to us sinners on the earth,*) but this mystically and after an ineffable manner. And generally they make it a mystery, but descend not to the revealing of the manner of it, leaving it as a matter of faith, but not of sense, to be believed, but not grossly fancied or described. I shall leave these, then, and apply myself to the latter sort, the other places of Scripture which speak of this matter, resolving that that must be the meaning of the words of Christ, 'This is my Body,' which by examination shall appear to be most agreeable to those other places. And of this sort of places, you may first take the passages in the Gospels themselves, Luke xxii. 20., where Christ saith of the cup (not the wine, but the cup, which refers to the action, the pouring out and drinking) that it is a new covenant in his blood which was shed for us. Which it seems is all one in sense with that other, Mark xiv. 24. 'This is my blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for many;' and in Matthew, 'This is my Blood, that of the New Covenant,' &c. Which being put together as parallels to interpret one the other, will conclude, that Christ's blood was truly shed for our benefit, particularly to seal a new Covenant betwixt God and us, and that this sacrament was the exhibiting that Covenant to us: as when God saith to Abraham, (Gen. xvii. 10,) 'This is the Covenant that I will make with you. Every male among you shall be circumcised;' *this circumcision is in effect called the Covenant, (as here the cup is the Covenant,) i.e. not only the sign of the Covenant, but a seal of it, and an exhibition of it,* a real receiving me into Covenant, and making me partaker of the benefits of it. And this you shall more fully see, if you proceed to the places in S. Paul, especially that, 1 Cor. x. 16."[1]

And proceeding to explain the Apostle's account of the insti-

[1] A Practical Catechism, lib. vi. sect. 4. I quote from the 12th ed. Lond. 1683. 8vo. pp. 402—405.

tution of the rite, 1 Cor. xi. 20, &c., so far from supposing that the words, "This is my Body," manifest the real presence of Christ's Body on earth, he proposes an entirely different mode of interpretation; observing,—

"Where, I conceive, the literal notation of the words will bear this observation, That as the word '*this*' in the latter words [i. e. "do this in remembrance of me"] signifies not the bread, but *the whole action or administration*—'do this'—i. e. do ye all that I have done in your presence, take bread, bless it, give it to others, and so commemorate me: so the same word—'*this*'—in the former speech—'This is my Body'—may signify *the whole action* too, viz., *that the breaking and distributing, taking and eating this bread, is the Body of Christ;* (in what sense you shall see anon;) like as when (Matt. xiii. 19) the words literally run thus,—'When any one heareth, &c., This is it which is sowed by the path side'—they must be thus necessarily explained: any man's hearing, and not considering, the word, and the 'Devil's coming,' &c., is *the meaning of that which is sowed by the path side;* or yet more plainly, like as verse 20,—'That which was sown upon the stony parts of the field, this is he that heareth the word,' &c.—where it is clear, the *seed* is not answerable to the *man*, but to the *word*, and that *ground* to the *man*. But the seed as it was sown on the ground all together, 'This is he (i. e. *this signifies him*) that hears the word, and receives it with joy.'" [1]

Now I do not agree with Dr. Hammond in this interpretation of the words, which seems to me unnatural and far-fetched, but nothing could more completely show his disagreement with those who would interpret these words as signifying a real presence of the Body in or under the bread.

And proceeding to explain St. Paul's words in v. 29, he thus paraphrases them:—

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, being unworthy by his impenitent sins to approach to so sacred an action, or behaving himself so unchristianly there, by thus eating and drinking engageth himself to damnation, not considering the death of Christ, which this was to commemorate, and the end thereof, that he should die unto sin, and give himself up to new life." [2]

Again, he says,—

[1] Ibid. p. 408. [2] Ibid. p. 409.

"'The cup of blessing which we bless,' or (as the Syriac) 'the cup of praise,' i. e. the chalice of wine, which is in the name of the people offered up by the bishop or presbyter to God with lauds and thanksgivings, i. e. *that whole eucharistical action* (and that exprest to be the action of the people as well as the presbyter, by their drinking of it) *is the communication of the blood of Christ*, a service of theirs to Christ, a sacrifice of thanksgiving, commemorative of that great mercy and bounty of Christ in pouring out his blood for them, and a making them (or a means by Christ ordained to make them) partakers of the blood of Christ, not of the guilt of shedding it, but (if they come worthily thither) of the benefits that are purchased by it, viz. the washing away of sin in his blood. So, in like manner, *the breaking and eating of the bread is a communication of the body of Christ*, a sacrifice commemorative of Christ's offering up his body for us, and a making us partakers, or communicating to us the benefits of that Bread of life, strengthening, and giving us grace. And both these parts of each part of this sacrament put together are (parallel to what was said of the Israelites and Gentiles) a mutual confederation betwixt us and the crucified Saviour; on our parts, an acknowledging him for our God, and worshipping of him; and on his part, the making over to us all the benefits of his Body and Blood, (*i. e. his death*) grace and pardon, to sanctify and to justify us."[1]

The question is then asked (the treatise being written in the form of a Catechism),—"You told me even now that you would "show me how the phrase, 'This is my body,' in the Gospel "(interpreted by this *taking and eating is my body*) was to be "understood: perhaps it may now be time for you to pay me "that debt:" to which the answer is as follows:—

"It is a fit season to do so; for this very phrase of St. Paul's, 'The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ,' is the key to open that difficulty, and indeed perfectly all one, of the very same importance with that. This breaking, taking, eating of the bread, this *whole action is the real communication of the Body of Christ to me*, and is therefore by some ancient writers called by a word which signifies the participation, (communication and participation being the same, only one referred to the giver, the other to the receiver,) the very giving Christ's Body to me; that as verily as I eat the bread in my mouth, so verily God in heaven bestows on me, communicates to me, the Body of the crucified Saviour.[2] And

[1] Ibid. pp. 412, 413.

[2] The latter words in this sentence, from "as verily," form the first extract in the *Catena*.

so all that I told you of the full sense of that phrase—*communication of Christ's body*—is again to be repeated here to *make up the sense of those words*, 'This is my Body:' which being so largely enlarged on, I need not now to repeat to you." [1]

Here, then, we see the words of the first extract in the *Catena with their context*, and we find, that so far from meaning the doctrine for which they are quoted in the *Catena*, they are used with reference to a totally different doctrine, namely, that *the whole action* of the sacramental rite is the communication of the Body of Christ, as more fully described in an extract I have given above.

Dr. Hammond afterwards gives the following summary of his doctrine on the point:—

"I will now give you a compendium or brief of the main substantial part of this sacrament. And that consists only of two branches, one on our parts performed to God, the other on God's part performed to us. That on our part is commemorating the goodness of God in all, but especially that his great bounty of giving his Son to die for us: and this commemoration hath two branches, one of praise and thanksgiving to him for this mercy, the other of annunciation or showing forth, not only first to men, but secondly and especially to God, this sacrifice of Christ's, in offering up his body upon the Cross for us. That which respecteth or looks toward men, is a professing of our faith in the death of Christ; that which looks towards God is our pleading before him that sacrifice of his own Son, and through that humbly and with affiance requiring the benefits thereof, grace and pardon to be bestowed upon us. And then God's part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, bestowing that Body and Blood of Christ upon us, not by sending it down locally for our bodies to feed on, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it: *as when the sun is communicated to us, the whole bulk and body of the sun is not removed out of its sphere, but the rays and beams of it, and with them the light and warmth and influences are really and verily bestowed or darted out upon us.* And all this is the full importance of—'This is my Body,'—or, this is the 'communication of his Body.'" [2]

And his explanation of "the full importance" of the words

[1] Ibid. pp. 413, 414. [2] Ibid. pp. 414, 415.

in the Catechism, that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received," &c., is as follows :—

"It is this, That in that sacrament God really bestows, and every faithful prepared Christian as really and truly receives the Body and Blood of Christ. As truly as *the bishop or presbyter gives me the sacramental bread and wine*, so truly doth *God in heaven bestow upon me on earth the Body and Blood of Christ*, i. e. the crucified Saviour, not by local motion, but by real communication, *not to our teeth, but to our souls*, and consequently exhibits, makes over, reaches out unto us, all the benefits thereof, *all the advantages that flow to us from the death of Christ:* the truth of which you had even now confirmed by the words of the Gospel explicated by the plainer expression of St. Paul, 'That the cup was the communication of the blood of Christ,'" &c.[1]

In this passage it is clearly stated, that what is given by the ministrant is only *sacramental bread and wine*, and that the Body and Blood of Christ are bestowed *directly* from God himself; which altogether negatives the notion of a real presence of that Body and Blood in or under the bread and wine.

Robert Nelson, Esq.

The extract given in the *Catena* from Robert Nelson,[2] the author of the celebrated work entitled "A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England," is itself a proof that he did *not* hold the doctrine of the Authors under review, for he distinctly repudiates in it the notion of the elements becoming the Body and Blood of Christ according to the *substance* of that Body and Blood, and therefore holds no real presence of the Body and Blood themselves in or under the elements. What he maintains in it is only a communication to the blessed elements of the "spiritual energy and virtue" of Christ's Body and Blood "by the power and operation of the Holy Ghost descending upon them." And therefore there can be no question as to what would have been his opinion of worship addressed to Christ's Body and Blood as under the forms of the elements, because he did not believe them to be there.

And in the immediate context he expresses himself more

[1] Ibid. p. 416.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 150, 151.

plainly to the same effect. For, explaining "the end and design of instituting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper," he says that the elements are by consecration "made *symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ*," and that this sacrament is intended "to be a standing monument of the infinite love of our Blessed Saviour in dying for us, and by outward signs, as *eating bread and drinking wine*, according to Christ's own appointment, to fix in our souls the memory of those invaluable blessings he hath purchased for us: and to communicate to all *worthy receivers* the benefits of his sacrifice, *upon which account it is called the communion of his Body and Blood.*" [1]

But the doctrine of Mr. Nelson on this point is more clearly expressed in a tract he published in the controversy with the Roman Catholics, in the time of James II., entitled, "Transubstantiation contrary to Scripture, or the Protestant's Answer to the Seeker's Request. Lond. 1688." 4to.,[2] in which we find the following among other similar passages:—

After quoting Articles XXVIII. and XXIX., and the Rubric after the Communion Service, he says,—

"From whence you see, that in the opinion of our Church, there is no other substance distributed among the communicants than that of the bread and wine; and that the Body of Christ is no otherwise present, than it is eaten, that is, 'after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' *in the spiritual blessings and effects of his merits and sufferings in his Body to those that do believe.* And in this sense we own a Real Presence, though at the same time we deny it in the sense of the Church of Rome." [3]

And, opposing the notion of the presence of Christ's body in a spiritual form, he says,—

"The letter is for us, that the Body had the natural properties belonging to a body, when our Saviour celebrated his last Supper. And the words must be understood in the same sense now as they were then; and, consequently, the Body has the same essential properties as then, that is, *to be extended, finite, and circumscribed.* Luke xxiv. 39; Acts i. 3; 1 John i. 1; Acts iii. 21. The letter is for us, that the Body of Christ is to continue in heaven, whither

[1] Companion for the Festivals, &c. 19th ed. Lond. 1748. 8vo. pp. 579, 580.

[2] It was published anonymously, but known to be by Mr. Nelson and attributed to him by all bibliographers.

[3] Transubst. contrary to Scripture, &c. pp. 11, 12.

he ascended, till the conclusion of the world. Acts i. 11; iii. 21; Hebr. ix. 28." [1]

"That the words, 'This is my Body,' are figuratively to be understood, I shall prove from the Scriptures before mentioned. 1. The word 'this,' in 'This is my Body,' is a proof of it. Bellarmine grants, that if the pronoun 'this' is understood of the bread, that then the word 'Body' must be *figuratively understood.* And whether it be not *this bread*, let the text explain. For what was it Christ took and set before them, but bread? What did he break, bless, and give, but bread? And of what did he say, 'This is my Body,' but of what he had thus taken, blessed, broke, and given? 2. It is said, That 'in the same night he was betrayed, he took bread,' 1 Cor. xi. 23, that is, before he suffered. And if what our Saviour then gave, and the Apostles eat, was truly and substantially his Body, and his Body really broken, and his Blood truly shed, then his Body was broken, and his Blood shed, while his Body was whole and not broken, and his Blood in its proper channels, and not shed. But if the words *broken* and *shed* were in that Supper to be understood *sacramentally and not literally*, then there is no reason from the words, 'This is my Body,' to understand them literally, and not *sacramentally or figuratively*. . . . . 3. Jesus himself then took the bread, and brake it, and gave it, when he said, 'This is my Body;' and yet Jesus had at that time a Body which was not broken, nor given, nor that they eat; and while he said these words, and they thus partook of *what he called his Body*, his Body remained entire before them. So that the same Body was broke and whole, one body and two, if the body he gave and they eat, was as much his body as the body that gave it, and they did not eat. 4. He said, 'Do this in remembrance of me;' he had told them before, Matt. xxvi. 11, 'Me ye have not always with you;' and so being to be *absent*, as he took care to send them a Comforter, so he left with them this institution to keep up the remembrance of his own sufferings and death; but *if he was to be always present in his body upon consecration*, and as much as he was at this institution, *that would have been inconsistent with remembrance*, for though the remembrance of its being doth not make it cease to be, ... yet *it* SUPPOSES THE ABSENCE *of the being;* and, therefore, *an institution to make the Body to be actually present, and yet therein to solemnize the remembrance of that body, is to suppose the Body to be present and absent at the same time.*" [2]

And he then proceeds to give a brief summary of the doctrine

[1] Ibid. p. 15.

[2] Ibid. pp. 17—19.

of the Church of England on the subject, which he does in these words:—

"Jesus the same night he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, &c., he said, Take, eat, this is my Body; this bread and the breaking of it; this cup and the pouring out of the wine, and the distribution of both among you, is (as the Lamb we have just now eaten is the Passover) *the memorial, figure, and representation of my Body and my sufferings in it that I am now to undergo*, and of that Blood I am to shed for the remission of sins. And because I shall leave you, and you may be apt to forget me and my sufferings, I do appoint this Supper to be continued to the end of the world for the remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth my death, and your belief of it. And as this cup is the sign and seal of the New Testament or Covenant which is to be confirmed by my blood, so this is a pledge of it to you, and of all the benefits thereby purchased, and which, in the *worthy* participation of this, ye shall receive: for the bread which you break is the communion of my Body, and the cup of blessing which is blessed, is the communion of my blood, *in all the spiritual fruits, advantages, and blessings of it*. And all this I shall as certainly give, and you as certainly receive, as if I was bodily present, and you were to receive them, as you do these elements, from my own hands." [1]

Mr. Nelson is, I believe, very highly esteemed by many of the Tractarian school. I commend these passages to their consideration.

Bishop Thomas Wilson.

For Bishop Wilson we need no more than one of the two extracts given in the *Catena* itself,[2] which is as follows:—

"He then offered up himself to God in *the symbols of bread and wine*, as a *pledge* of his *real* and natural body which he was just going to offer to God for the sins of the world. His *sacramental body* was given, offered, before he suffered. It was made his sacramental body by his almighty word, none but God could do it, we therefore invoke the Holy Ghost one God with him, to make the elements what Christ himself made them, his *sacramental body*, it

[1] Ibid. pp. 20, 21.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. p. 152.

being the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. . . . . It is *the Spirit, i. e. the Holy Ghost, sent upon them in the prayer of the priest, which conveys to us the seed of eternal life.*" [1]

In these words a distinction is expressly drawn between his *real* body and his *sacramental* body. And instead of any presence of his real body in a spiritual form being imagined, all that is maintained is, such a union of the Holy Spirit with the elements as to make them effectual for the purpose designed. And by this union they are supposed to be made what he calls the *sacramental* Body and Blood of Christ.

And so elsewhere he says,—

"We, while we feed on this bread, now *endued with a life-giving Spirit,* and live as we ought to do, are in no danger of death eternal: these being pledges to assure us, that as certainly as bread and wine do nourish our bodies, so do these seal to us all the benefits which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his sacrifice and death." [2]

And again,—

"This bread and wine, which are to represent the sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, are sanctified, or set apart, for this holy use, by giving thanks to God for all his favors, and especially for having sent his only Son to redeem us by his death; and by begging of him, that when we receive and eat and drink *this bread and wine,* we may be *so far made partakers of the sacrifice of his most blessed body and blood, as to share in all the benefits which he hath obtained for us by his death.* . . . . . They [i.e. serious Christians] know also, that the blessings obtained for us by Christ's death, of which this sacrament is a remembrance, are as much the food of the soul, as bread and wine are of the body;—that *this food or support we receive by a lively faith in his merits;* [3] and do therefore, at this time more especially, acknowledge the efficacy of his death." [4]

Not only, therefore, does he not imagine any real presence of Christ's true body, but he expressly *excludes* it, his "sacramental body" being formed by the union of the Spirit with the elements; and therefore the question of the worship of Christ's

[1] Ibid. quoting from his Sacra Privata, Parker's ed. 1853, p. 107.

[2] A short Introduction to the Lord's Supper. Sect. 1. Works, 1796. ii. 20.

[3] From these words it is clear that he held, that the spiritual food to be received in this sacrament is not received by the wicked.

[4] Instruction for Indians. Ibid. iii. 232, 233.

body as present under the forms of the elements drops at once, for that body is *not* supposed to be there. And the only question I should be disposed to raise with Bishop Wilson is as to the nature of the union of the Holy Spirit with the elements; which, in his case, would I believe be, in reality, only a question of words. He would probably have spoken of the water of baptism exactly in the same way.

Dr. William Nicholls.

The passage quoted from Dr. Nicholls [1] merely speaks of "a change in the elements" by consecration; which I need not stop now to show proves nothing as to his views.

They who wish to know the real doctrine of Dr. Nicholls on the question under discussion will, I think, find it sufficiently clearly expressed in the following passage, taken from the work from which the extract in the *Catena* is given. On the words of the Catechism, "The body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed," &c., he writes thus:—

"When the bread and wine are said by our Saviour to be his Body and Blood, it must not be thought, that there is a substantial change of the elements, as the Papists pretend. For our Saviour's words, 'This is my body,' &c. must chiefly be understood *in a figurative sense, to mean, this is the sign of my Body, or, This does represent it;* which metaphorical way of speaking, as it is common to all languages, so it is especially used in the Scriptural; where the seven kine are said *to be* seven years; dead men's bones to *be* the house of Israel; the golden head to *be* Nebuchadnezzar; ten horns to *be* ten kings; and yet no one ever dreamt of a real change, but ONLY A REPRESENTATION, by these expressions. Add to this, that in the very institution of the Jewish Passover, which the Lord's Supper in the Christian Dispensation is instituted in lieu of, the same metaphorical expression is used, 'This is the Lord's Passover;' *the eating this (i. e. the Paschal Lamb) doth represent the Lord's passing over the first-born of the Israelites.*"

He then proceeds to notice the "great unreasonableness" and "monstrous absurdities" of transubstantiation; and these "monstrous absurdities" mentioned by him are precisely those

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. p. 76.

which the doctrine of the Authors under review shares with it, for they are these :—

"For Christ's body to be at the same time in heaven and earth; to be of the dimensions of a human body, and of that of a wafer; to be broken in one place, and entire in another; upon the altar and in the bodies of the faithful; moved at the same time East, West, North and South, according as it is carried towards the several communicants differently sited."

So that, as to the real presence of the true body and blood of Christ, even in an immaterial form, (for such is the Romish doctrine,) on every Communion Table, he ridicules the notion as involving "monstrous absurdities."

And on the words "verily and indeed" &c. he writes thus :—

"But as we Protestants do avoid the gross errors of the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, yet we do allow, that our Saviour's Body is really received by all faithful communicants. The elements do not only barely represent our Lord's Body, with his death and passion; but *whilst we are performing this action, our Saviour's Body, in some inexplicable manner, which we do not presume to define, is exhibited to us, if we come to this sacrament with a true faith and pious resolutions;* FOR (ART. 29.) WICKED UNBELIEVERS (AS OUR CHURCH TEACHES) DO NOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE LORD'S SUPPER."[1]

L'ESTRANGE, SPARROW, AND WHEATLY.

The extracts given from the three other Ritualists, L'Estrange, Sparrow, and Wheatly,[2] are as utterly insufficient to show that they held the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison as the extract given from Dr. Nicholls, and probably, had we as full evidence of their views as we fortunately have in the case of Dr. Nicholls, we should find them in perfect agreement with him on the question. For, the extracts from L'Estrange and Wheatly say nothing more than what we noticed as stated in the extract given from Dr. Nicholls, namely, that by consecration the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, which of course

[1] NICHOLLS's Comment on the Book of Common Prayer. Lond. 1710. fol. On the *Catechism*.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 119, 127, & 131.

they do *sacramentally*, and that not merely in the way of figurative representation, but as instruments, in the case of the worthy communicant, for making him a partaker of that body and blood.

But, as we found to be the case with Dr. Nicholls, so no doubt should we have found it to be with them, had we any dogmatic statement of their views on the subject to refer to, that they used these words as the other divines of our Church, already quoted, used them; namely, in the sense which I have just mentioned.

The only passage in these extracts which goes beyond this, is that from Bishop Sparrow, where it is said, that on the delivery of the elements "the communicant is to answer Amen; "by this Amen, *professing his faith of the Presence of Christ's "Body and Blood in that sacrament.*"[1]

But it has yet to be proved, that he meant, that the Body and Blood of Christ were to be considered as present *in, or under, or under the forms of, the bread and wine*, and not rather that they were present *in the sacramental rite* (the more ordinary meaning of the phrase, *the sacrament)*; which we hold them to be, in a spiritual manner, to all devout communicants.

These phrases will give no difficulty to any one well informed on the subject; nor would such a person dream of determining an old writer's doctrine on the point now under discussion from the mere use of such phrases.

Dr. Brett.

Among other Authors quoted in the *Catena* is Dr. Thomas Brett,[2] who is on various accounts as unfortunate a referee as the compiler could have selected, for, in the first place, Dr. Brett seceded from our Church, joining the party of the Nonjurors; secondly, he did not hold the doctrine of a real presence of Christ's body and blood in or under the elements; and thirdly, he maintained that the language of the Church of England in its Communion Service is irreconcileable even with such a doctrine of a virtual presence as he held.

[1] Ibid. p. 127.

[2] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. pp. 77, 78.

So far was he from holding the doctrine of the Authors under review, who, like the Romanists and Lutherans, maintain a real presence of Christ's natural body in a supernatural form, that he ridicules the idea of such a multipresence of Christ's body. He says,—

"The absurdity both of the Roman and Lutheran doctrine is so apparent, that I need not trouble myself here to refute it; for *the natural human body of Christ cannot be in heaven and in ten thousand places on earth at the same time,* as it must be according to either of their opinions."[1]

"Most certainly it was the opinion of the ancients, that the bread and the cup in the Holy Eucharist are the only Body and Blood which Christ appointed us to eat and drink. . . . . This petition [in the ancient Liturgies] that the Holy Ghost may make this bread the Body of thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of thy Christ . . . . can never be understood of the natural Body of Christ, which was long since formed in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and is now in heaven, and which being already glorified is become unchangeable. . . . But the Holy Ghost descending upon, and operating in, the bread and the cup, may give it a quickening life-giving virtue, and so make it Christ's Body *in power and effect;* and it may then as properly be called Christ's Body and actually be so, as John the Baptist *was Elias, because he came in the spirit and power of Elias.* . . . Therefore there is no need of eating or drinking the natural Body and Blood of Christ for this purpose; his sacramental or spiritual body, *that is, bread and wine mixt with water, made his Body and Blood in full power and effect* by the operation of the Holy Ghost, is as effectual by virtue of his institution as his natural Body and Blood could be."[2]

"The doctrine of the truly ancient catholic and apostolic church is, that the bread and wine blessed, sanctified, or consecrated with thanksgiving in memory of Christ's death, are the Body and Blood of Christ, which we are to eat and drink in the Holy Eucharist, and *not the natural Body and Blood, which are in heaven.* Mr. Johnson has proved this to have been the doctrine of the primitive Fathers for the first five centuries."[3]

"It is certain, that though the bread and wine remain, retaining their natural substance, yet *so far as these elements are capable of becoming Christ's Body and Blood, so far they are so.* And that they

[1] Discourse concerning the necessity of discerning the Lord's Body in the Holy Communion. Lond. 1720. 8vo. Pref. p. ix.

[2] Ibid. Pref. pp. xvii, xviii. [3] Ibid. p. xxii.

are capable of receiving a quickening life-giving virtue by the operation of the Holy Ghost in them and with them, and so becoming the Body and Blood of Christ *in full power and effect*, that whoso worthily feedeth on them, may thereby obtain eternal life as effectually as Adam in Paradise might have obtained it by feeding on the Tree of life, is not, I think, to be doubted. And as Christ is the bread of life, whatsoever food is blessed with this supernatural life-giving virtue, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, may very properly *be called*, as our Saviour *called* the Eucharistical bread, *the Body of Christ, without any qualifying or abating words.*" [1]

Dr. Brett's doctrine, therefore, is altogether different from that of the Authors under review; and we see, from the extracts just given, what he means when he speaks of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. He merely means bread with a life-giving virtue infused into it by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which he calls the Body of Christ, "*without any qualifying or abating words;*" and therefore, to quote his use of such expressions in support of the doctrine of a real presence of Christ's natural body in a supernatural form, is only to mislead the reader. And, of course, as to any worship of Christ's Body as under the forms of the elements, he could not have permitted it on his view, for Christ's Body is *not there* according to his doctrine.

And even this doctrine he considers (as we have seen [2]) to be irreconcileable with that passage in our Communion Service in which we pray, that "we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine may be partakers of his most precious Body and Blood," because the petition implies, that we may be partakers of the bread and wine without partaking of Christ's Body and Blood, while, according to Dr. Brett's notion, the bread and wine are so made Christ's Body and Blood, by the Holy Spirit descending upon them on their consecration, that all the communicants receive *what he calls* Christ's Body and Blood. And I agree with him, that these words of our Communion Service are inconsistent with the notion of even this virtual presence. For if the Body and Blood we are to receive in the Eucharist are what Dr. Brett holds them to be, and are produced as he supposes, then that Body and Blood are received by all the

[1] Ibid. p. 30.

[2] See pp. 615, 616 above.

communicants. But the passage in the Communion Service shows, that, whatever the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist are supposed to be, our Church holds, that they are *not* received by all, for we are taught to *pray*, that they *may be* received by us when we receive the consecrated elements.

Rev. John Johnson.

From John Johnson, the learned author of "The Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar Unveiled and Supported," the Compiler of the *Catena* has actually given thirty-six pages,[1] while the fact is, that his doctrine, *clearly and expressly laid down by him in the very work quoted from*, is exactly that of Dr. Brett, and therefore entirely different from that of the Authors under review.

This will clearly appear from the following passages:—

"As they [i. e. the ancients] *deemed the Eucharistical Body and Blood to be bread and wine, and so* COULD NOT BELIEVE THAT THE SUBSTANTIAL BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST WERE IN THE EUCHARIST, so they did often call the sacramental bread and wine, types, antitypes, figures, likenesses, images, and symbols of Christ's natural Body and Blood."[2]

He then proceeds to show, that they, nevertheless, considered the consecrated elements to be full of *efficacy*, saying of Theodoret, for instance,—"*He plainly makes the sacramental Body and Blood to be but symbols*, and yet much to be preferred to anything under the Law;"[3] and having added some remarks on the virtue and efficacy of the sacramental elements, he thus states his view of their nature and the grounds on which they are entitled to be called Christ's Body and Blood:—

"Though the ancients believed the bread and wine in the Eucharist to be the Body and Blood; yet they did not believe, that they were the natural or substantial Body and Blood; but that they were so in a spiritual manner, *in power and effect:* so that the bread and wine are not the Body and Blood in themselves considered, nor merely by their resembling or representing the Body and Blood; but *by the inward invisible power of the Spirit*, by

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. ii. pp. 39—76.

[2] The Unbloody Sacrifice, &c. Chap. ii. § 1. Vol. i. (2nd ed. 1724.) p. 154.

[3] Ibid. p. 155.

which the sacramental Body and Blood are made *as powerful and effectual for the ends of religion, as the natural Body itself could be,* IF IT WAS PRESENT. And it is ON THIS ACCOUNT THAT IT IS CALLED CHRIST'S SPIRITUAL AND MYSTERIOUS BODY, as being discerned to be what it is by the inward not the outward eye; by our faith, our minds and spirits, not our senses. And this, when proved, is a full answer to the objections above-mentioned, for though bread and wine, abstractedly considered, are indeed weak elements, yet when enriched with the special presence and invisible operations of the Spirit, they are very efficacious and beneficial. Though bread and wine in themselves can be no more than figures; yet when the Holy Ghost has blessed and sanctified them, they are *in power and effect to us* the same that the archetypes would be." [1]

"Our Saviour has promised his presence with us to the end of the world; and we know how he fulfilled this promise, viz., by the sending the Paraclete to abide with us for ever. THE VISIBLE MATERIAL SUBSTITUTES OF CHRIST'S HUMAN NATURE ARE THE BREAD AND WINE; and when the Holy Spirit, which is his invisible representative, communicates its power and presence to the symbols, which are his visible representatives, they do thereby become *as full and authentic substitutes* as it is possible for them to be." [2]

"The Lutheran doctrine, though it come nearest to that of Transubstantiation, (FOR IT SUPPOSES THE GRAND ABSURDITY OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION TO BE TRUE, WHICH IS, THAT THE BODY OF CHRIST DESCENDS FROM HEAVEN[3] TO MANY THOUSANDS OF ALTARS AT ONE AND THE SAME TIME; but it denies the other great absurdity of Transubstantiation, the annihilation of the bread and wine) yet in one respect is, I think, *altogether worse and less tenable;* viz., because it supposes two bodies and bloods in the sacrament, the typical and the substantial. For the bread and wine are figures of the body and blood; and figures may bear the names of their principals; and further, together with this typical Body and Blood, they believe they have the very Body and Blood of Christ, which was born of the Blessed Virgin, and shed upon the Cross." [4]

"*I am not sensible that any single Father ever asserted, for the first four hundred years, that Christ's personal Body and Blood can be substantially present to us here on earth.* Even Gregory Nyssen, who goes farther, I think, than any had done before him,

[1] Ibid. pp. 180, 181. [2] Ibid. p. 186.

[3] Verbally this is incorrect, because it is denied that the Body of Christ "descends from heaven;" but Johnson describes the doctrine *in his own language,* that is, the language he thinks most suitable for it.

[4] Ibid. p. 216.

never supposes Christ's natural Body to be brought down from heaven to the communicants; but rather that the bread of the Eucharist was, by *addition*, converted into his true Body, if I understand him right. They call the consecrated bread a Divine heavenly thing, or substance; but they do not call it the substance of the Body of Christ; and they call it a Divine substance, because they believe it sanctified by the Holy Ghost. *They call the sacramental bread and wine, the true, very Body and Blood, meaning, that it was so in power and efficacy.*" [1]

"The ancient Church did not believe, that the true substance of Christ's Body and Blood was given by the celebrator, or by any other means, either with or without the bread." [2]

"I conclude therefore, that though the Eucharistical elements are not the substantial Body and Blood, nay, they are the figurative and representative symbols of them; yet they are somewhat more too; they are the mysterious Body and Blood of our ever-blessed Redeemer. *By the mysterious Body and Blood, the reader will easily perceive, I mean neither substantial, nor yet merely figurative, but the middle between these extremes, viz., the bread and wine made the Body and Blood of Christ by the secret power of the Spirit,* and apprehended to be so, not by our senses, but by our faith, directed and influenced by the same Holy Spirit; and made the Body and Blood in such a manner as human reason cannot perfectly comprehend." [3]

It appears, therefore, from these extracts, that Mr. Johnson held a totally different doctrine from that of the Authors under review, and opposed their doctrine, and considered it in some respects less tenable than Transubstantiation. And Archdeacon Wilberforce, of whose doctrine Archdeacon Denison is a professed follower,[4] expressly repudiates and condemns Johnson's view as utterly unsound.[5] And yet we here find Archdeacon Denison—such are the inconsistencies of his case—referring to Johnson as maintaining his doctrine.[6]

[1] Ibid. p. 220. [2] Ibid. p. 223. [3] Ibid. p. 232. [4] See p. 22 above.

[5] "[Johnson] admits the existence of a *res sacramenti*, but instead of supposing it to be that Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and which suffered on the Cross, he imagines that a new body is formed for our Lord out of bread and wine by the power of the Holy Ghost. . . . Johnson cannot have perceived how subversive is this notion of the whole economy of the Gospel." WILB. on Euch. 312; or, 3rd ed. 268.

[6] I state this, not simply from the *Catena* having been put in for his defence *as a whole*, but from observing that in his "Defence," as published since his trial, the testimony of Johnson is among those there given.

But Johnson, holding these views, of course speaks of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, (calling the bread and wine, vivified, as he supposes, by the Holy Spirit, under that name,) and of their reception by *all* the communicants, the wicked as well as the faithful; and I need hardly say, that the extracts in the *Catena* are taken from such passages; and the reader is left to infer, that he used these expressions in the sense of there being a real presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ, though, in the context, such a doctrine is expressly and repeatedly repudiated and condemned.

Again we must observe, in this case, that *worship* of the Body of Christ as under the form of the bread, could not have been tolerated by Johnson, because he firmly maintained that the real Body of Christ was *not* there.

As it respects the question of the consistency of Johnson's doctrine with that of our Church, (though the present issue is not affected by it,) I must say that I agree with Dr. Brett, that it is not consistent with the statements of her Formularies.

Dr. Edward Pelling.

Twelve pages of the *Catena* are occupied with extracts from Dr. Pelling,[1] and it would have been easy to have given twice as many, which, apart from those in the context that explain them, might be interpreted as speaking the doctrine here controverted. But all depends upon the sense in which the words are used, as we have seen over and over again in the extracts already given, that the real Body and Blood of Christ may be said to be present and given to the communicants by those who use these expressions in a totally different sense from that in which they are used by the Authors under review.

Dr. Pelling, like Dr. Brett and Mr. Johnson, repudiates and ridicules the notion of Christ's natural Body and Blood being present in a spiritual form in or under the elements, and given to the communicants. He says,—

"This is a certain principle of reason, that a man can have but *one* body, and so we are to conclude, that Christ himself had no

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 133—145.

more. But if that which he gave to his disciples was his very *natural* body, consisting of so many organical parts, then had he more bodies than one (*even as many as there were morsels*), because it is supposed, that every disciple received the Body of Christ entirely. . . . Either his natural body is not in the wafer at all, or else it is not there wholly and entirely, or else it must be supposed to be multiplied proportionably to the number of the consecrated wafers. And hence it must follow of necessity, that as at the institution of this sacrament, Christ had some bodies which were not crucified (for the Supper was before the Passion, and that body which every apostle did eat was never crucified), so still that Christ hath an indefinite number of bodies, even as many as there are communicants in the whole world. . . . Again, secondly, these are certain and eternal principles of reason; that *one and the same body can be but in one and the same place at once*, as my body cannot be here and at the Indies in the same moment, for then it would be one body, and yet not one at the same time. . . . A body must be *circumscribed and limited to a determinate space* proportionable to its dimensions, for else it would be a finite and yet an infinite substance." [1]

And he reckons among the "monstrous absurdities" of Transubstantiation, "that Christ's human flesh is circumscribed in heaven, (as every body must be confined to a certain place,) and yet at the same time is in millions of places here on earth, and yet one body still; . . . . that if you break those wafers into a thousand particles, that the body of Christ is one still, and whole in every the least particle;" &c. [2]

"As touching the Body of Christ, the Scripture tells us, that it is gone up into heaven, there to abide till the day of final judgment. To this purpose S. John tells us (chap. xiv. and xvi.) that Christ spake to his disciples before his death, telling them that he was about to leave them, and to depart from them, that he was going his way to the Father, and was leaving the world. Which expressions must necessarily be understood of his *bodily absence*, that his human nature was to be no longer here below, or else the sense would be impertinent and to no purpose. . . . . Men were as good take the holy writers by the throats, and with violent hands keep them from speaking at all, as dispute against such plain and full evidence touching *the absence of our Saviour's natural body*." [3]

[1] Discourse of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Lond. 1685. 8vo. c. 7. pp. 173—175.

[2] Ibid. p. 176.

[3] Ibid. pp. 181—183.

The doctrine of the Authors under review is thus entirely repudiated and condemned by Dr. Pelling.

And when he goes on to speak of there being, nevertheless, a real presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, (his meaning, when using this phrase, we shall see presently,) still he maintains, that the wicked do not receive what he calls the Body and Blood of Christ. For he says,—

"Again, whereas St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xi. 27, 'Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord;' he doth seem manifestly to conclude, that Christ's Body and Blood is really in the Eucharist, that all *worthy* communicants do indeed receive Christ's very Body and Blood by receiving the elements, and that Christ's Body and Blood are verily tendered and offered even to the unworthy, though THEY RECEIVE THEM NOT." [1]

But at the same time Dr. Pelling maintains, that there is *a spiritual Body of Christ* which is received in the Lord's Supper. And the reader, looking merely at the phrase itself, might suppose that he advocated the notion of the real body being present in a spiritual form. But this is far from being Dr. Pelling's meaning. Otherwise, indeed, he would not have spoken as he has of the Romish doctrine, because the Romanists hold that the body is only present in *a spiritual form*. The phrase certainly is one which is very likely to lead to a misconception of his views, and Mr. Johnson (whose doctrine we have just been considering) complains of his having "advanced a notion of Christ's having two personal bodies," [2] but when we come to read his explanation of what he means by the phrase, we find that it is not a body, but the influence of a body, which he so calls. For he says,—

"This then being manifest, that our Saviour hath a spiritual body, of which (and of which alone) we do participate, I am now in the next place to show *what that spiritual body is*. NOW BY HIS SPIRITUAL BODY WE MEAN THE SPIRITUAL VIRTUES OF HIS GLORIFIED BODY; *those heavenly streams of grace which flow from him; those vital powers which we receive into our bosoms through him; those Divine operations which our poor souls depend upon*

[1] Ibid. c. 9. p. 226.

[2] Unbloody Sacrifice, vol. i. ed. 1721. p. 225.

him for; those celestial and admirable influences, which are derived to his whole Church from his throne of glory." [1]

"Now these spiritual virtues we receive from Christ are called his body, his flesh and blood, upon these three accounts. 1. Because they have the like natural properties which flesh and blood hath, and tend to the like ends and purposes to which flesh and blood serveth. . . . . 2. These spiritual virtues do issue immediately from Christ's human nature, and therefore when we receive them, we are truly said to participate of Christ's Body. . . . . S. Cyril . . . by Christ's Real Presence in the sacrament understood nothing else but the presence of those heavenly virtues and influences, which are *called his Body* because they are the distillations and effects of his glorified human nature. . . . . We are as truly said to partake of Christ's Body, when we partake of these blessings, as we can be said to partake of a spring, when we drink of the waters which stream and flow from it. 3. Besides, nothing is more usual among mankind, than to give the denomination of things to the *virtue and efficacy of those things.* So we are said to be warmed with the fire, when we only feel its heat, and to have the benefit of the sun, when we are comforted only with its rays. . . . . Neither is it any impropriety of speech to say, that our hearts are wrought upon by the Body of Christ, that we are *partakers of his Body*, that we are enlivened and comforted by his very Body, *when we receive those spiritual virtues which are darted from that glorified Body of his which is in heaven.*" [2]

"In regard that by the use of the blessed sacrament we receive *virtues and influences* from our Lord's glorified humanity, we are very rightly said, to *communicate of his Body.* In regard that these virtues are not imaginary ideas, but real things (real in themselves, and of real effect and operation), it is very proper to affirm, that Christ is really present in the sacrament." [3]

"This I will presume to affirm, that where any of the ancients do harp upon Christ's presence in the sacrament, they mean *his presence by his grace and virtue;* and where they speak intelligibly and distinctly of this matter, they speak plainly to this purpose; intending by the Body and Blood of Christ, which we receive, neither more nor less, than *those efficacious virtues which are derived to his Church from his glorified humanity; this they call his Body and Blood*, especially where they call it, by way of distinction, the spiritual Body, and the spiritual Blood of our Blessed Redeemer." [4]

[1] Ibid. c. 9. pp. 233, 234.
[2] Ibid. pp. 236—240.
[3] Ibid. c. 10. p. 261.
[4] Ibid. pp. 270, 271.

Whatever, then, we may think of the aptitude of the phraseology used by Dr. Pelling, it is clear from these passages what he means; and that what he means is doctrine *toto cœlo* distant from that of the Authors under review.

Bishop Warburton.

One more extract given in the *Catena*[1] it is important to notice, and that is the passage from Bishop Warburton. It stands thus:—

"The learned Catholic Bishop [Bossuet] saith true, that Protestants have but lamely justified the figure of 'This is my Body,' &c., by those others of 'I am the Vine,' 'I am the Door.' And his reason is solid. 'Jesus,' saith he, 'in the institution of this rite was neither propounding a parable, nor explaining an allegory.'" Discourse on the Lord's Supper, Works, vol. x.

And a marginal note is affixed to it by the Compiler of the *Catena* in these words, — "The words of institution, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' *not to be understood figuratively.*"

After the proofs already given of the character of this *Catena*, the reader will perhaps not be *greatly surprised* to learn, that Bishop Warburton, in the very argument from which these words have been cited, with the marginal note just quoted affixed to them, is earnestly contending *against the doctrine of the Real Presence and in favor of the view that the words of institution are to be interpreted in a figurative sense.* He is replying to Bossuet, and he says,—

"I have said enough of the commemoration, and now turn to the *Real Presence* of the Catholic Bishop. He rests it, we see, upon the force of the words [i. e. This is my Body, &c.], which in his opinion can admit of no figurative sense, without doing extreme violence to human language and expression. Indeed, as far as regards the hardness of the figure, I believe, most Protestant doctors have been ready enough to join with him. But this difficulty, great as it is, I presume, the preceding account of the specific nature of the Lord's Supper will entirely remove. By that account it appears, *that the words of the institution are* FIGURATIVE; and so far from suffering any violent conversion, that the sense of bread

[1] Doctr. of Real Presence, &c. Pt. i. pp. 154, 155.

and wine fall into the *figure* of body and blood, naturally and easily, nay, what is above all, NECESSARILY.[1] We have shown the Last Supper to be of the nature of the *feasts upon sacrifice:* in which feasts the very Body sacrificed was eaten. Now as this rite was to be instituted and first celebrated by the very person himself who was offered up for our redemption, the institution must needs precede the sacrifice. Of necessity, therefore, some *symbolic elements* must be given, to be received by the participants, *instead of* the very Body and Blood. But as the flesh of the animal sacrificed was the meat eaten in the feast after the sacrifice, the symbolic elements of bread and wine are naturally properly and elegantly *called, his Body and Blood.* . . . . Thus doth the establishment of the specific nature of this rite serve to remove a difficulty which hath long embarrassed all the several opposers of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, by showing that the FIGURATIVE WORDS of the institution are easy, natural, elegant, and *necessary*. It likewise very well accounts for another difficulty *which the advocates for a Real Presence throw in the way of* COMMON SENSE."

And having proceeded to meet this difficulty, and again shown that the words of institution are to be understood in a figurative sense, he adds,—

"Here too let me observe, both against our Catholic and Protestant writer, that on this idea of a *feast upon sacrifice* (which no one, I think, can doubt but the primitive Christians had of the Lord's Supper) it would naturally follow, that Antiquity should always speak of this rite in the strongest terms of veneration; as that through which the highest benefits of our religion are conveyed. And this they might do without much exaggeration on the one hand, or *any conception of a Real Presence* on the other."

Then comes the passage quoted in the *Catena,* in which the Bishop finds fault with *one particular mode* of justifying "the figure of 'This is my Body,'" but does not hint that it is *not a figure* (his whole argument proceeding, as I have shown from his own words, upon the notion that it *is* a figure), and immediately adds the following words:—

"But when he would have us infer from hence, that there could be no *other occasion for such a figure,* he imposes his usual art upon us. He would not speak out. He knew there were other occasions; such as, The declaring the nature of a rite; which was

[1] His own capitals.

the case in question." . . . . "In the mean time, his [Bossuet's] triumphant conclusion loses much of its lustre.—'That, in a word,' says he, 'which I pretend to evince, is, the embarras into which the words, "This is my Body," throws all the Protestant party. For either we must confound all the mysteries of religion, or else give a reason why Jesus hath not used these forcible terms in any of his institutions but that of the Last Supper. If his Body and Blood are equally present, and as really received by the faithful elsewhere, in the celebration of every other act of faith, there was no reason for chusing these strong terms for the institution of the Eucharist, rather than for Baptism; and eternal Wisdom would, in this case, have expressed itself at random. This point I foretell shall be the eternal and inevitable confusion of the Defenders of the *figurative sense*.' (Hist. des Var. tom. i. pp. 477, 478.) We see, this mighty difficulty, which is eternally to embarrass the *Defenders of the figurative sense*, is confessed to be at an end, on the discovery of one good reason, why such *forcible terms* are employed in the institution of the Last Supper, and not in Baptism, or in the other rites of our religion. *To send it agoing therefore, we need but observe*, That the Last Supper, as a feast upon sacrifice, referred to the sacrifice on the Cross, in which the Body and Blood of Christ were offered for our redemption. Now, to design and indicate *such* a feast by the *words* of the institution, the forcible terms in question were naturally, properly, nay necessarily employed. And the reasoning which evinces this, *evinces likewise that they were used in a figurative sense.* On the contrary, the initiatory rite of Baptism referred to another baptism already in use; in both of which the matter administered being water, an element at hand, it was rightly called, in the institution of the Christian Baptism, by its proper name. But *flesh and blood* being the things administered in the ancient feasts upon sacrifice, and they not being at hand at the institution of the Last Supper, *the elements substituted in their place were, in an elegant conversion, called by the improper and very necessary names of Body and Blood.*" [1]

His whole argument, we see, is specially directed to prove *the figurative sense* of the words of institution, and he thinks the contrary notion of a *Real Presence* an offence against *"common sense."*

Such is the argument out of the middle of which a few words have been cited to prove that Bishop Warburton held, that the

[1] Discourse concerning the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Works. Lond. 1811. 8vo. vol. x. pp. 340—346.

words of institution are *not figurative,* and that there *is* a *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ in or under the consecrated elements!

I have now gone through all the testimonies of any moment in the *Catena,* in fact, almost all that are to be found there, and I leave the reader to judge what is its real character. Extracts inappropriate and inadequate to prove the point for which they are quoted may readily be pardoned, but the charges that might be brought against this *Catena* are of a very serious kind indeed; so serious that I am unwilling to enter upon the subject. A long list of passages, produced as proofs of their Authors having held doctrine which, in the case of almost all the writers quoted, the slightest inquiry into their views shows that they did not hold—most of them even occurring in treatises in which the doctrine in support of which they are cited is expressly repudiated and opposed, and many of them cut out of paragraphs, or even sentences, in a way which shows a deliberate mangling of the words of the author for the purpose of misleading the reader as to the nature of their statements—stands upon a very different footing from a few mistaken references. And if such a *Catena* as this, boldly pushed upon the public eye and boasted of as affording incontrovertible evidence of the agreement of the doctrine of the Authors under review with that of a large body of the leading divines of our Church, can produce any other effect than that of withdrawing the confidence of the public from those who have so urged it, then indeed is the cause not only of truth but morality itself in peril.

To the Authors already quoted I will add one more, who was referred to in a Tractarian work, published some years since, as an advocate of the doctrine of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in or under the bread and wine, namely,—

Archbishop Sharp.

The passage cited was this,—

"But what then? Do we not in the sacrament truly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ? God forbid that any one should

deny it. There is none that understands anything of the sacrament but must acknowledge, that therein to all *worthy receivers* the Body and Blood of Christ is both given and likewise received by them. This is the sense of the Church of England, when she doth so often declare, that she owns the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood to all that worthily receive the sacrament." "We do indeed own that Christ is really present in the sacrament to all worthy receivers, and in our Communion Service we pray to God to grant that we may eat the flesh of his dear Son and drink his blood, &c. All this we own, and it is very necessary we should." Sermon on Transubstantiation, vol. vii.

Looking at this passage through the medium of Archdeacon Denison's interpretation of the phrases that occur in it, nothing more would be wanted to fix Archbishop Sharp as a supporter of the doctrine of the Authors under review. But, nevertheless, what Archbishop Sharp's doctrine was, will pretty plainly appear from the following passages *in the context* of that just quoted. The words cited are spoken with reference to an objection that the Church of England, though not holding the doctrine of Transubstantiation, holds that of "the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood to all worthy receivers." This the Archbishop at once admits, and in the words quoted above. But having done so, he *immediately goes on* to show *what the words mean;* and as his interpretation of the meaning in which he used them would at once have convicted the Tractarian citer of them of an attempt to mislead the reader, no notice is taken of it. The Archbishop proceeds thus:—

"*But now all the question lies here, In what sense these terms or phrases or expressions are to be understood.* They of the other Communion contend, that the eating Christ's flesh, or the partaking of his Body and Blood, is to be understood in a strict, literal, proper sense. We say, that the literal sense is impossible, because Christ could not give away his body to the Apostles, while he was alive, with his own hands; much less could he give it to them broken and crucified before he was crucified. And therefore these expressions are to be understood in a spiritual mystical sense; such a sense as the apostles must be supposed to understand them in, when they received Christ's body and blood from the hand of our Saviour himself. . . . The plain meaning of our Church is this: In the Holy Communion, as in the other sacrament of baptism, there is the sign, and the thing signified; the outward part, or

sign of the Lord's Supper is the bread and wine; the inward part, or the thing signified, is the body and blood of Christ. Now as our bodies are made partakers of the bread and wine, for their strengthening and refreshment, so (if we receive them worthily) our souls are made partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ, to their strengthening and refreshment. These are the words of our Church Catechism. *But then this Body and Blood of Christ are to be understood in such a sense, as a soul can be supposed to feed upon a body, or to receive strength and nourishment by feeding upon it.* But now the Body of Christ can be no otherwise a food for the strengthening and refreshing our souls, than only as *the spiritual benefits of that Body and Blood, that is to say, the virtue and effects of Christ's sacrifice upon the Cross, are communicated to it;* nor is the soul capable of receiving those benefits otherwise than *by faith.* So that the Body and Blood of Christ, in the sense of our Church, are only *the benefits of Christ's passion,* that is to say, the pardon of sin, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, and a nearer union with Christ; and our eating and drinking of that Body and Blood, is our being made partakers of those benefits; and *the mouth,* whereby we thus eat and drink, that is, the means whereby we are made partakers of those benefits, is *our true and lively faith.*

"This is plainly the sense of our Church in this matter. It is certain, she cannot mean the body of Christ, in any other sense than what we have now declared, because she expressly affirms, That Christ hath but one body, and that body is now in heaven, and not here; and she declares further, That that body which we eat, is for the nourishment of our souls, (which the body of Christ, in a proper literal sense, though it were here present, could not contribute anything to). And lastly, she declares, That the mouth, whereby we partake of this body, is faith: which is such a mouth as never was heard of, for the eating a body truly and properly so called.

"The sum of all this is, That when we talk of the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, or say, that, to the worthy receivers, the body and blood of Christ is communicated, we mean no more than this, That the Holy Spirit of Christ is present at every such ordinance of God; and that whosoever comes prepared with faith and repentance, and devotion and charity, that Holy Spirit will not fail *to apply to every such communicant the very body and blood of Christ broken and shed for us, that is, all the virtue and all the benefits and effects of Christ's sacrifice.*

"So that if any one ask you, whether you own the Body and Blood of Christ to be truly present in the sacrament, your answer

to this question must be by another question. Ask them what they mean by the Body and Blood of Christ. If by those words they mean the spiritual presence of Christ Jesus, for the conveying all the benefits and effects of his body that was crucified, and his blood that was shed for mankind, to all those souls that do piously and worthily commemorate his death by the sacrament, in this sense you do, with the Church of England, own a real presence of Christ's Body and Blood to all worthy communicants. But if by the Body and Blood of Christ, they mean the substance of his Body and Blood which was taken of the Virgin Mary, and was crucified and shed at Jerusalem, and is now at the right hand of God *in this sense, according to the Church of England, you cannot own any real presence, but rather* A REAL ABSENCE. For Christ hath but one body, and that body is in heaven, and not here, it being against the truth of his natural body to be in more places than one at the same time.

"This now is a plain, and clear, and intelligible account of the matter. And *this*, I believe, *and no other, is the sense of the Church of England about the Real Presence*, so far as we can judge by her most public authentic declarations. And this hath been her sense about it *ever since the Reformation*."[1]

SECTION V.

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING TESTIMONIES.

SUCH is the testimony of the writers whom Archdeacon Denison and the Compiler of the *Catena* have themselves put forward as their witnesses to prove, that the doctrine here controverted has been maintained by many of the divines of the Church of England. And it appears that these writers have been carefully selected from among those considered most likely to favor such doctrine. For the Compiler of the *Catena* tells us in his "Advertisement" to his First Part, that his extracts "are taken exclusively from authors who have entertained what is termed 'high eucharistic doctrine,'" and that he "has avoided giving any passages from the writings of such as have

[1] ABP. SHARP'S Works. 3rd ed. Lond. 1754. 8vo. Vol. vii. pp. 280—285. The passage occurs in a sermon on John vi. 53.

held what are called 'low views' concerning this holy Sacrament."

If, therefore, the testimony even of these writers is adverse to the doctrine of the Authors under review, then is it clear, that no evidence is producible in its favor from Anglican divines. It stands utterly destitute of all support of the kind. The pretence, that the Authors under review are only teaching the same doctrine that a number of our great divines have taught before them, is altogether without foundation.

Now I would only ask the reader to run his eye again over the extracts given in the preceding part of this chapter, if necessary, and consider what authors could be fairly quoted as having taught the doctrine of the Authors under review. The language with which Archbishop Wake concluded his examination of the authorities produced in his day from Anglican divines to prove their maintenance of such a doctrine, I will venture to assert, is as applicable in the present case,—"Thus "have I considered the several divines produced for this *new* "*conceit concerning the Real Presence*, and shown the greatest "part of his authors to be evidently against it; some not to "have spoken so clearly that we can determine anything con- "cerning them, but *not one that favors what they were alleged* "*for*."[1] Indeed, five of the authorities chiefly relied on in the present case, namely Hooker, Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, Forbes, and Thorndike, were among those of whom Archbishop Wake made this remark.

Differ, no doubt, they do, to a certain extent, in their views on the subject, but there is *one doctrine* which *all* who have in any definite way delivered their doctrine on the subject *agree in repudiating*, namely, the notion of a real presence of the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, even in a spiritual and immaterial form, (and, in fact, no other presence of them is imagined even by the Romanists) in or under the elements; and *that is the doctrine of the Authors under review.*

Those who are unacquainted with the various ways and senses in which, in this subject, the same phrases are used by different writers, might easily suppose, from reading a few isolated

[1] See p. 914 above.

extracts from their writings, that the views of many of these writers were the same as those of the Authors under review. And unfortunately men are but too apt to judge hastily in such matters, and to save themselves the trouble of further inquiry by jumping at once to a desired conclusion. And hence the injury done to the cause of truth by such *Catenas* as that we have been examining. But when we come to inquire into the *meaning* which those writers affixed to these expressions, we at once find how differently they are applied by different divines. The real presence and the true reception of the Body and Blood of Christ are equally asserted by writers who attach totally different senses to these phrases, both as to the character of the presence and the reception, and the nature of what they call the Body and Blood of Christ. Two writers, moreover, will alike speak of a conjunction of the Body and Blood of Christ with the elements, the one meaning only such a union as that the Body and Blood of Christ are, in a spiritual way, given *with* the elements in the case of the *faithful* communicant, the other using the phrase in the sense of the two being so joined together, that all who receive the one do in that act necessarily receive the other, and that the substance of Christ's Body and Blood is on the Table united to the elements. Other illustrations of the different senses in which these and other phrases are used might easily be added.

The real doctrine of an author, therefore, can only be arrived at by a review of his general dogmatic statements on the subject. To quote a few isolated passages containing certain phrases, give to those phrases one particular exclusive meaning, and then quote the writer as a witness in favor of the doctrine which that *meaning* indicates, as has been done in the present case, and charge him with self-contradiction if he has elsewhere said anything opposed to what that *meaning* implies, betrays either great want of familiarity with such subjects, or what is worse.

There may indeed sometimes occur, even in the best authors, as we have seen,[1] *incidental* expressions, which, if they stood alone and were strictly interpreted, might seem to indicate a

[1] See pp. 850, 851; and 888 above.

doctrine inconsistent with their dogmatic statements elsewhere. But if these are merely casual expressions, and definite statements of doctrine are made by them elsewhere, it would be hard measure to mete out to such men as Jeremy Taylor, for instance, to say, that their testimony was worthless on account of such supposed self-contradiction; as if such casual expressions were not to be interpreted by their formal dogmatic statements. Would the Authors under review be quite willing themselves to submit to such a test?

The true test of the consonancy of the doctrine of the Authors under review with the teaching of any particular divine, is this,—not whether this divine used certain phrases that they use to express their doctrine, but whether they use, or would be willing to use, certain *other* phrases and statements which that divine used, and by which he showed what his real views were. The question as it respects the Authors under review is not a question of words and phrases, but what their doctrine is, as a whole. They might use even objectionable phrases, but if they accompanied the use of them with statements showing that they gave to the words a meaning consistent with orthodox doctrine, they would not by the use of the words lay themselves open to the charge of holding false doctrine, though they might be blamed for using injudicious language. But, on the contrary, they not only use such phrases, but they accompany them with statements showing that they use them in a meaning which necessarily involves *unorthodox* doctrine. The charge against them is, that they are formally inculcating a system of doctrine opposed to the doctrine of our Church.

What was the doctrine of nearly all the Authors even of the list just examined, and especially of those among them who have the best title to be taken as the expounders of the true meaning of our Formularies, such as Cranmer and Jewel, is, I hope, sufficiently plain from the extracts given above. They clearly maintain, that the presence of Christ's body is like the presence of the sun; that it is present to operate upon the souls of men, and to be brought into the most intimate spiritual union and communion with them, but not so present as that its substance is on the Table or in our mouths. And they hold that it is a presence not to the elements themselves, but to the com-

municants in the reception of the elements; to which it may be said to be, by the gift of it *accompanying* the elements in their reception, conjoined. But this presence of Christ's Body to our souls, and our union and communion with it, are not supposed to be given by man, but are a Divine gift attending the reception of the sacramental *signs* of Christ's *broken body* and *shed blood* given by man; and attending it only in the case of the worthy communicant, i. e. when we, eating the *signs* with our *mouths*, do also by *faith*, as the *mouth of the soul*, spiritually eat Christ's true Body *as broken*, and spiritually drink his true Blood *as shed*, that is, when our souls spiritually feed upon him as dying for us on the Cross. Then it is that we are made partakers of the benefits of his sacrifice, and moreover brought into communion with his present glorified Body as replenished with all the graces of the Spirit. And hence our divines truly speak of a real presence of Christ's Body, i. e. his glorified Body, to us in the Sacrament; and justly insist upon our eating his true material Body, and drinking his true material Blood, even that very Body and Blood that were broken and shed on the Cross, for no other Body and Blood, no Marcionite figment of an immaterial substitute for that Body and Blood that suffered on the Cross, would satisfy a true and genuine faith. Faith fixes its eye upon *the Lamb slain*, and looks to *the reality* and feeds upon it.

Christ crucified is what we are taught by the very words of institution to feed upon in the Eucharist; and therefore it is Christ's Body, in its *character* of *the Lamb slain*, that we are called upon to eat in this rite. The rite is instituted as a *remembrance* of Christ's *death*, not in celebration of his present glorified state. But as he now *lives*, as *the Lamb slain*, we are thus united to him as a *living* and *glorified* Saviour. We are made partakers of his Body in that double character in which it is represented as now existing in heaven, as *a Lamb slain* as a propitiation for our sins, and as nevertheless still living, and possessing power and spiritual gifts by which it can act, as if it were locally and substantially present, upon every individual believer throughout the world. To suppose it to be necessary that the substance of that Body should be on earth, is to take away from that Body the privileges it possesses through

its union with the Godhead. "The natural body of Christ," says Dean Aldrich,[1] "which is locally only in heaven, does as "effectually impart its virtue to every worthy communicant, as "if it were locally present to each of them upon earth; and is "therefore said to be really present in the Eucharist."

And if men would only raise their minds above sensible objects, and realize this act as purely an act of the soul, there would be no difficulty in understanding what is meant by eating and drinking the true material Body and Blood of Christ.

The bread broken and the wine poured out in the Eucharist have been constituted by our Blessed Lord to be the symbols and memorials of his broken body and shed blood, till he come again; and he who worthily partakes of these symbols, and at the same time feeds by faith on the true Body broken and Blood shed on the Cross as a propitiation for his sins, will receive the gift of union and communion with our Lord's glorified Body, which, through the power of that Spirit that dwells in it, can be present in influence and operation with every individual throughout the whole world.

But no other *worship* of Christ in this sacrament is consistent with this doctrine than of his Person as existing in heaven, as is well shown by Dean Aldrich in the treatise already quoted, where he vindicates Bishop Andrewes and others from holding any other doctrine, telling his opponent, that "the "King's [James I.], the Bishop's, and the Church's meaning "is very plain, viz., that since Christ's natural Body is not to "be adored but where it is corporally and locally present; and "it is not so present in the Eucharist: that therefore in the "sacrament (i. e. in the celebration) the worthy communicant, "to whose soul that Body is really present, is to adore the "Person of Christ in heaven, where alone his Body is locally "present."[2]

On the notions which a few of the above writers have advo-

[1] Reply to two Discourses, &c. Oxf. 1687. 4to. p. 24. I may here observe, that this treatise of Dean Aldrich is a reply to the same work to which Archbishop Wake replied, as mentioned above, pp. 912, 913, and that he laughs to scorn the attempt of the author to charge certain divines of the Church of England with holding the doctrine of the real presence of the substance of Christ's Body and Blood on earth in the Eucharist.

[2] Reply, &c. (ut supra) p. 34.

cated, that either by a Divine virtue from Christ infused into the elements by consecration, or by a junction of some kind of the Holy Spirit with the elements, a sacramental Body and Blood of Christ are formed, which may be properly called his Body and Blood, it is not necessary now to enlarge, especially as any such doctrine is totally different from that of the Authors under review, and apparently altogether opposed by them, and expressly by Archdeacon Wilberforce. Untenable also as they are, they are open to far less serious objections than apply to the doctrine here controverted. Neither of them labors under the monstrous error of supposing the true Body of Christ to exist under two different forms, and to be present simultaneously on thousands of Communion-tables all over the world; directly contrary to the doctrine of the Rubric:—neither of them labors under the revolting absurdity of supposing the real Body of Christ, in a spiritual and immaterial form, to be received into our mouths and eaten with the consecrated bread: above all, neither of them opens the door to the worship of Christ's Body as existing under, or under the forms of, the bread and wine,—a worship which must be directed towards the consecrated elements, as much as the worship of the heathen is directed towards their idols, and for the same cause, namely, the supposition that the object of worship has taken up its abode there.

And when we come to examine what authorities there are in favor even of these doctrines in our Church, we shall find no such evidence as would entitle them to a favorable consideration.

The doctrine of Thorndike, that the elements are made the Body and Blood of Christ by being "united to the Spirit, that is, the Godhead of Christ," and thus united to the natural Body and Blood of Christ,[1] Archbishop Wake justly calls "a *particular* notion in this matter;"[2] and says that it is "*widely different*" "*from ours*," i. e., the doctrine of our Church, "and therefore that we are not to answer for the consequences of it."[3] And the high-churchman Dean Aldrich says of it, when quoted by Woodhead for the same purpose for which it is

[1] See pp. 905, 906 above.

[2] WAKE'S Discourse, &c. (ut supra) p. 70.

[3] Ibid. p. 90.

quoted in the *Catena*,—"The notion is neither the Church of "England's, nor, as I believe, any other Church's: nor does "he so much as pretend that any other man, much less any "Church, ever taught it." [1]

The language of Bishop Bull, which might seem to some to favor a doctrine of a somewhat similar kind, will be found on examination very different. The nature of his doctrine is thus stated by Archdeacon Waterland. Waterland, after quoting the passage given from him in p. 891 above, says,—

"Here it is observable, that by Spirit of Christ, Bishop Bull could not mean the third Person, but the *Logos*, which only is hypostatically united to the humanity of Christ; and that that Spirit is not said to *reside* in the elements, but to *accompany* them, and to the *worthy* only: so that the virtual union can amount only to an union of *concurrence* (not of *infusion* or *inherence*) whereby Christ is conceived to *concur* with the elements, in the *due use* of them, to produce the effects in *persons* fitly disposed." [2]

And therefore, though to a certain extent he coincided with Grabe's view on the subject, he differed from him on two important points, namely, first in maintaining only a union of *concurrence*, not of *infusion* or *inherence*, and secondly in limiting the reception of the *res sacramenti* to the *worthy* receiver.

The doctrine of Dr. Pelling is almost peculiar to himself, perhaps quite so, unless Dr. H. More may be considered as joining him in it. And all his strong expressions about our receiving Christ's Body and Blood amount to next to nothing, when we find his definition of the "spiritual body" we receive, to be, "the spiritual *virtues* of his glorified Body, those heavenly *streams of grace* which flow from him," &c.[3] And he expressly guards himself against any contradiction of Article XXIX., by maintaining, that though "Christ's Body and Blood [i. e., of "course, that sort of Body and Blood which he supposes to be "present] are verily tendered and offered even to the *unworthy*," "*they receive them not*." [4]

There were, no doubt, a few in the early part of the last

[1] Reply to Two Discourses, &c. Oxf. 1687. 4to. p. 18.

[2] WATERLAND'S Sacramental Part of Eucharist explained in a Charge, &c. Works, ed. 1843. vol. v. pp. 190, 191.

[3] See. p. 947 above.

[4] See p. 947 above.

century, namely, Dr. Grabe, Dr. Brett, Mr. Johnson, and perhaps some others, who held, that the Divine virtues and graces of the Body and Blood of Christ are so *infused* into the bread and wine as to become one with them, so that they may be considered as being thus made truly the Body and Blood of Christ, and consequently that the Body and Blood of Christ [i. e. *such* a Body and Blood as are thus formed] are received by the mouth, and of course by *all* the communicants. But, of these, Dr. Brett candidly acknowledged, as we have seen,[1] that his doctrine of the reception of (what he called) the Body and Blood of Christ by *all*, was not reconcileable with the language even of our Communion Service.

The remarks of Archdeacon Waterland on this notion, written shortly after it had been advocated among us by the authors above-mentioned, are so just and pertinent, that I shall transcribe a portion of them :—

"Great stress has, by some amongst us since 1702, been laid upon the invocation and illapse of the Holy Ghost upon the elements; not barely to make them *sacred* signs and pledges, or *exhibitive* symbols of Christ's Body and Blood to every *faithful* communicant, (which might reasonably be admitted,) but even to make them the *very body*, or *verily* the *body* of Christ: not the *natural* body, but another true body, called a *spiritual body*, consisting, as is presumed, of elements changed in their *inward* qualities, and *replenished* either with the Holy Spirit himself, or with the *graces*, or *virtues*, or *energies* of the Spirit; (Grabe ad Iren. lib. iv. c. 34. pp. 327, 328.) supposed to be *intrinsic* to them, *inherent* in them, permanent with them, and *received* both by *worthy* and *unworthy* communicants. . . . [And having quoted some passages inculcating this view from Grabe's Defence of the Greek Church, he adds,—] Whoever looks into Scripture, or genuine Antiquity, will there find but very little ground or colour for these or the like speculations; which appear rather to have been borrowed from Damascen of the eighth century, or from the more modern Greeks, or the Pseudo-primitive Liturgies. . . . The Fathers very well knew how to distinguish between a power *adsistant* to, or *concurrent* with the element, [i. e. of water in baptism,] and a power *infused* into it, or *lodged* in it; and they were well aware of the difference

[1] See pp. 615, 616 above.

between the *virtue* of *Baptism* (meaning the *whole* solemnity, in which *God* bears a part) and the *inherent* virtue of the consecrated *water*, which means quite another thing, and is a late invention of dark and ignorant ages. As to the Eucharist, for the first three centuries, and part of the fourth, nothing at all was said, so far as appears, of any descent of the third Person upon the elements; nothing of his forming them into Christ's body. . . . In the fourth century some illapse of the third Person upon the elements was commonly taught, and that justly, provided it be but as justly understood. Not so as to make the sacramental body a compound of element and spirit, after the way of the modern Greeks; nor so as to make the third Person the proper food of the Eucharist, or the *res Sacramenti*, for the *Logos* was always considered as the food there spiritually given and received: yea it was the incarnate Logos, and therein stands our *mystical union* with Christ as improved and strengthened in that sacrament. But the work of the Holy Ghost upon the elements was to translate or change them from *common* to *sacred*, from *elements* to *sacraments*, from their *natural* state and condition to *supernatural* ends and uses, that they might become holy signs, certain pledges, or exhibitive symbols of our Lord's own natural body and blood in a mystical and spiritual way. Not that any change was presumed, either as to the *substance* or the *inward qualities* of the elements, but only as to their *outward* state, condition, uses, or offices. For like as when a *commoner* is advanced into a *peer*, or a *subject* into a *prince*, or a *house* into a *church*, or a *laic* into a *priest* or *prelate*, there is a change of *outward* state, condition, circumstances, and there are *new* uses and offices, *new* prerogatives, *new* glories, but no change of *substance*, no, nor of *inward* qualities, implied: such also is the case (only in a more eminent degree) with respect to the elements of the Eucharist; when they are *consecrated* by the priest, when they are *sanctified* by the Holy Ghost, when they are rendered *relatively holy*, when they are transformed from *common* to *sacred*, when they are exalted from mean and low uses, in comparison, to the *highest* and *holiest* purposes that such poor things could ever be advanced to. Such a *change*, or *transmutation*, as I have now mentioned, frequently occurs in the primitive writers, more than this (I am competently assured) will not be found in any certain and undoubted monuments of Catholic writers within the first six centuries. So long as symbolical language was well remembered and rightly understood, and men knew how to distinguish between

figure and verity, between signs and things: while due care and judgment was made use of, to interpret the *literal* expressions of Scripture and Fathers *literally*, and *figurative* expressions according to the *figure*: I say, while these things were so, there could be no room for imagining any *change* in the elements, either as to *substance* or *internal* qualities, nor for supposing that our Lord's words, 'This is my body,' were to be otherwise interpreted than those parallel words of the Apostle, 'that rock was Christ.' For as the word *Christ*, which is the *predicate* in one proposition, is to be *literally* understood, and the *trope* lies in the verb *was*, put for *signify*, or *exhibitively* signifies; so the word *body*, which is the *predicate* in the other proposition, is to be literally interpreted of the *natural* or *personal* body of Christ, and the *trope* lies in the verb *is*, put for *represents*, or exhibitively signifies. And as it would not be right to say that the *rock* was literally a *spiritual* Christ, distinct from the *real Christ*, making *two Christs*; so neither can it be right to say or conceive, that the *bread* in the Eucharist is a *spiritual body* of Christ, making *two true bodies* of Christ. But as the rock was a *symbol* of the one true Christ, so is the sacramental bread a *symbol* exhibitive of the one true body of Christ, viz. the *natural* or *personal* body, given and received in the Eucharist: I say, given and received *spiritually*, but *truly* and *really*; and the more *truly*, because *spiritually*, as the *spiritual* sense, and not the *literal*, is the *true* sense." [1]

And it is worth observing, that in the Leipsic Acts, certainly an impartial testimony, as quoted by Archdeacon Waterland, it is said of Grabe's doctrine,—"Ex his vero patet, quod licet in articulo de Cœna, alienam a pontificiorum transubstantiatione sententiam habuerit Grabius, tamen in eodem ab Anglicana etiam—Ecclesia *haud parum discrepaverit*." [2]

Archdeacon Waterland then proceeds to point out the doctrine of the Fathers, and the various corruptions that gradually crept in after the seventh century, when the notion began to prevail that the elements must become in some way or other the very body and blood of Christ. "From thence," he observes, "came *augmentation*, *assumption*, *impanation*, *compo-* "*sition*, *consubstantiation*, *transubstantiation*, *local presence*, and "*oral* manducation of the *res sacramenti*, *inherent* virtues, *bread-*

[1] Ibid. pp. 187—193.

[2] Act. Lips. p. 281. A.D. 1722. as cited by Waterland, l. c. p. 188.

"*sacrifice, bread-worship,* and the like; all issuing from the "same source, all springing from the same root; namely, "*from that 'servilis infirmitas,' which St. Austin speaks of, the "mistaking signs for things, and figure for verity.*"[1]

And he remarks, that even among some of the earlier Protestants, "the nature of *symbolical* grants and *constructional* "conveyances was not so well considered as might have been "wished. Many understood not what *eating* could mean, unless "it were conceived to be *oral* and *literal:* neither could they "suddenly bring their minds to comprehend how a thing could "be said to be given and received at the Supper, without being "literally, locally *present* in the Supper, *in the very tokens or* "*pledges* of the heavenly things then made over to every faith-"ful communicant. As if *livery* and *seisin* might not be given "and taken by proper instruments: or as if a *ring,* a *book,* a "*crosier,* or other tokens of investiture, might not convey lands, "honours, dignities, without being inwardly *enriched* with, or "outwardly *converted into* the very things themselves which "they so convey. For as any person becomes legally vested in "an estate by the delivering and receiving of deeds, though he "does not literally take the lands and tenements in his hands, "nor grasp them in his arms: so may a person, in construction "of Divine law, be vested in or possessed of the Lord's Body "and Blood, and whatever depends thereupon, without literally "receiving the same into his mouth."[2]

And then proceeding to notice the doctrine of *our own early Reformers,* he says,—

"*Our divines, as Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, &c., (to do them justice,) understood this matter perfectly well. Neither do I know of any considerable person amongst our early Reformers who missed the right thought: unless perhaps we may except the great Bishop Poynet, in his exile at Strasburg, where he died A.D.* 1556."

He then continues his remarks under the idea that Bishop Poynet (as he calls him) wrote the "Diallacticon," and points out—not that that treatise advocates the doctrine of the presence of Christ's Body and Blood in or under the elements, but —that "he appears to carry the notion of *inherent* virtues or

[1] Ibid. p. 208. [2] Ibid. pp. 208, 209.

"graces, as lodged in the *elements* themselves, much too far: "and he seems to make the conjunction of grace and element "absolute and physical: by which means he found himself at "length involved in insuperable perplexities upon the point of "adoration of the elements, and the communion of the un- "worthy; though he endeavoured to get off from both, as "handsomely as the thing would bear:" while "our other "more cautious divines of that time, as Cranmer and Jewel, "had *no concern with those perplexities, any more than the ancient* "*Fathers had;* for they avoided the main principle from which "those difficulties arose; yea and FLATLY CONTRADICTED IT:" and further, that he appears "not to have guarded sufficiently "against the notion of *two* true bodies of Christ, *natural* above, "and *spiritual* below, in the Eucharist."[1]

The difficulty arising from Bishop Ponet's supposed discrepancy from his brethren in this matter, I trust I have thoroughly cleared up,[2] by showing that he was *not* the Author of the "Diallacticon," and that he has left us a Sermon in which his views on the subject are fully expressed and coincide altogether with those of Cranmer, opposing in the most decided terms not merely the doctrine here controverted, but also such as is propounded in the "Diallacticon;" the existence of which Sermon does not seem to have been known to Waterland.

Archdeacon Waterland concludes his notice of these "notions of the Eucharist" by observing, that they "appear to be little "else but the remains of that confusion which first began in "the decline of the seventh century: and the fundamental error "of all lies in the want of a right notion of *symbolical* language, "as before hinted. Hence it is that *signs* have been sup- "posed either literally *to be,* or literally *to inclose,* the very "things *signified,* viz. the Divine Body, or the Divine graces, "virtues, or powers."

In his larger work on the Eucharist, entitled, "A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity," Archdeacon Waterland has entered still more fully on all the various points connected with the subject. And I may just observe, while quoting his work, that, as it respects

[1] Ibid. pp. 209—211. [2] See pp. 777—787 above. [3] Ibid. p. 225.

the Fathers, he thus sums up, after a careful review of the statements of several of them, what he considers to be *their* doctrine on the subject,—

"All intended to say, that the elements keeping their own nature and substance, and not admitting a coalition with any other bodily substance, are *symbolically*, or in *mystical construction*, the Body and Blood of Christ; being *appointed* as such by Christ, *accepted* as such by God the Father, and *made* such in *effect* by the Holy Spirit, to every *faithful* receiver. So ran the general doctrine from the beginning and downwards; neither am I aware of any considerable change made in it till the dark ages came on, the eighth, ninth, tenth, and following centuries." [1]

But the object for which I refer to this work is, to direct attention to his remarks on the effects of the Reformation on this subject, and the doctrines that have since that time been advocated; more particularly as they relate to our own Church and her divines: not as pledging myself to an agreement with him in all his remarks, or at least expressions, but as placing before the reader his opinion as to what have been the views of our divines.

"Luther first, and afterwards Zuinglius, attempted a reform in this article: but it was difficult to clear off the thick darkness all at once; and so neither of them did it to such perfection as might have been wished. One threw off *transubstantiation* very justly, but yet retained I know not what *corporal*, *local* presence, and therefore did not retrench enough: the other threw off all corporal and local presence very rightly, but threw off withal (or too much neglected) the *spiritual presence* and *spiritual graces*: which was retrenching a great deal too much. It must however be owned, that apologies have been since made for Zuinglius, as for one that erred in *expression* rather than in real *meaning*, or that corrected his sentiments on second thoughts. (See Abp. Wake, Disc. on the Holy Euch. p. 83.) And it is certain that his friends and followers, within a while, came into the old and true notion of *spiritual* benefits, (see Hooker, vol. ii. p. 327,) and left the low notion of naked *signs* and *figures* to the Anabaptists of those times; where they rested, till again revived by the Socinians, who afterwards handed them down to the Remonstrants. Calvin came after Zuin-

[1] Review &c. (ut supra) c. 7. Works vol. iv. p. 599.

glius, and refined upon his scheme, steering a kind of middle course, between the extremes. . . . . [He then criticises Calvin's statements, objecting to some of his expressions, and adds:] Our divines who came after Calvin had some advantage in point of *time*, and a greater still in the rule or method which they pitched upon, as most proper to proceed by: which was, not to strike out any new hypotheses or theories by strength of wit, but to inquire after the *old paths*, and there to abide. Archbishop Cranmer took this method: he was a judicious man, and a well-read divine; and more particularly in what concerns the Eucharist. We have the sum of his doctrine in the first page of his preface. . . . . [He then quotes a passage the greater part of which will be found p. 771 above, and after commenting upon it proceeds thus:] I may spare myself the trouble of reciting the sentiments of Bishop Ridley and Bishop Latimer and Mr. Bradford of that time, and of Bishop Jewel who came not long after: for they all agreed, in the main things, with Archbishop Cranmer, who may therefore be looked upon as *instar omnium*, while in him we have all. . . . . [He then quotes passages from Bishop Barlow's Defence of the Articles of the Protestant Religion and Dean Aldrich's treatise above-quoted, as showing 'how our acutest divines have, time after time, hit off the difficulties which were once very perplexing,' and finally sums up their views in the following words:] The sum of all is, that *sacramental* or *symbolical* feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body *broken* and blood *shed*, under the signs and symbols of *bread* and *wine*: the result of such feeding is, the strengthening or perfecting our *mystical union* with the body *glorified*; and so, properly speaking, we feed upon the body as *dead*, and we *receive* it into closer *union* as *living*, and both in the Eucharist when *duly* celebrated." [1]

Before I close this chapter, the reader may be glad to see the way in which Archdeacon Waterland sums up his answers to the various doctrines on the subject under discussion which he considers to be erroneous; and with this extract I shall conclude.

"1. To the Romanists, who plead warmly for *the very body and blood* in the Eucharist, we make answer, that we do receive the *very body and blood* in it, and through it, as properly as a man *receives* an *estate*, and becomes *possessed* of an *inheritance* by any deeds or conveyances: and what would they have more? Will nothing satisfy, except the *wax* and *parchments* be transubstan-

[1] Ibid. pp. 599—608.

tiated into *terra firma*, or every *instrument* be converted into *arable?* Surely, that is pushing points too far, and turning things most serious into perfect ridicule.

"2. To the Lutherans, who seem to contend for a mixture of the visible elements with the body invisible, we have this to reply, that we readily admit of a *symbolical* delivery, or conveyance, of one by the other; which effectually answers every good end and purpose, as it suits also extremely well with the Scripture phraseology in those cases. And though we admit not that our Lord's Body is locally present in the Sacrament, or any where so present but in heaven; yet so long as it is really united in *one mystical body* with ours, or rather is considered as the *head* with the *members*, we think, that may suffice; and we need not desire any closer alliance, on this side heaven, than such an *union* amounts to.

"3. To the Calvinists of the ancient stamp, (if any such remained now,) we might reply, that though we eat not Christ's glorified body in the Eucharist, yet we really *receive* it, while we receive it into closer *mystical union* than before: and though we know nothing of the diffusion of any virtue of Christ's flesh, (which would not profit,) yet we have the power and presence of his Godhead with us, and, at the same time, a *virtual* or *mystical* union with his *body*, sufficient to make us, in Divine *construction* and Divine acceptance, *one with him:* 'for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.'

"4. To the Zuinglian Sacramentarians, old Anabaptists, Socinians and Remonstrants, who will not admit of any *medium* between local corporal presence and no presence at all as to beneficial effects, no medium between the natural body itself, and mere signs and figures; to them we rejoin, that there is no necessity of falling in with either extreme; because there is a medium, a very just one, and where indeed the truth lies.[1] For though there is no corporal presence, yet there is a spiritual one, exhibitive of Divine blessings and graces: and though we eat not Christ's natural glorified body in the Sacrament, or out of it, yet our *mystical union* with that very body is strengthened and perfected in and through the sacrament, by the operation of the Holy Spirit. . . . .

"5. To those who admit not that the natural body of Christ is in any sense received *at all*, but imagine that the *elements*, as impregnated or animated with the *Spirit*, are the *only body* received,

[1] This answer is equally applicable to the Authors under review, for they refuse to admit any medium between the two notions.

and are made *our Lord's body* by such union with the Spirit; I say, to those we make answer, that the union of the Spirit with the elements (rather than with the *persons*) appears to be a *gross notion* and *groundless:* and if it were admitted, yet could it not make the elements, in any just sense, *our Lord's body*, but the notion would resolve into a kind of *impanation* of the Spirit for the time. Besides that the consequence would be, that *the Lord's body* is received by *all* communicants, *worthy* or *unworthy;* which is not the truth of the case.[1] Wherefore, to avoid all such needless suppositions and needless perplexities, let us be content to teach only this plain doctrine; that we eat Christ crucified in this sacrament, as we partake of the merits of his death: and if we thus have part in his crucified body, we are thereby *ipso facto* made partakers of the body glorified; that is, we receive our Lord's body into *a closer union* than before, and become his *members* by repeated and stronger ties; provided we come worthily to the holy table, and that there is no just obstacle, on our part, to stop the current of Divine graces.

"I may shut up this account with the excellent words of Archbishop Cranmer, as follows, only put into the modern spelling:—'The first Catholic Christian faith is most *plain*, *clear*, and *comfortable*, without any difficulty, scruple or doubt: that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although he be sitting in heaven, in equality with his Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance, who by his death delivered us from death, and daily nourishes and increases us to eternal life. And in token hereof, he hath prepared bread to be eaten, and wine to be drunk of us in his Holy Supper, to put us in remembrance of his said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the benefits which we have thereby: which *benefits*, through *faith* and the *Holy Ghost*, are exhibited and given unto all that *worthily* receive the said Holy Supper. This the husbandman at his plough, the weaver at his loom, and

[1] Waterland adds here the following note,—"If the elements are supposed to be *united* to, or *enriched* with, the Spirit, all that receive must of course receive the Spirit, and be sanctified by him. For the presence of the Spirit, in this case, is not to be understood merely of the *essential* presence extending equally to all creatures, but of a *gracious* presence: and if such *gracious* presence is vouchsafed to the *unworthy* as well as *worthy*, then the *benefits* must be *common* to all, and none can eat and drink their own damnation. *The fundamental error of this hypothesis* (AS ALSO OF THE LUTHERAN AND ROMISH) *is the connecting the grace of the Sacrament with the* ELEMENTS, *instead of looking for it in the* PERSONS *only*.

the wife at her rock, can remember, and give thanks unto God for the same: this is the very doctrine of the Gospel, *with the consent wholly of all the old ecclesiastical doctors.*' (Cranmer against Gardiner, p. 396. first edit.)" [1]

I have thought it desirable, when examining the testimony of the divines of our Church, in the preceding section of this chapter, to confine myself to the works of those Authors who have been quoted on the opposite side. But I would here add, before I conclude, that, among other works illustrative of the true doctrine of our Church in this matter, of which there are a large number well worthy of perusal, the reader will find the question of the Real Presence ably handled by Archbishop Usher, in his "Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge," and Sermon before the Commons in 1620."

[1] Ibid. pp. 608—610.

Appendix.

A.

On the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice maintained by Archdeacon Wilberforce, with evidence of its inconsistency with that of the Fathers.

I do not purpose entering here at any length on the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice. If the views maintained in the preceding pages are correct, it is evident that there can be no *such* sacrifice in the Eucharist as Archdeacon Wilberforce supposes, because there is no *such* real bodily presence as is required for that purpose. But it may be of use briefly to point out the utter inconsistency of Archdeacon Wilberforce's doctrine on the subject with that of the Fathers, and this may be done within the compass of a very few pages.

The Archdeacon maintains, "not only that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice, but that the thing sacrificed is the reality, or *res sacramenti*, that is, the Body and Blood of Christ;"[1] that "the eucharistic sacrifice" is "the offering up of Christ himself;"[2] "that very sacrifice" which our Lord offered on the cross;[3] and that our acceptance is obtained through the "sacrifice of the altar."[4] And it is not "a *repetition* of the sacrifice of the cross," only because it is a *continuation* of that sacrifice, a part and portion of it, that sacrifice having only been *commenced* upon the cross, and continued ceaselessly ever since.[5]

Now I will not here go again into the question, what is the change produced upon the elements by consecration. But,

[1] pp. 389, 390; 3rd ed. pp. 335, 336.
[2] p. 392; 3rd ed. p. 338.
[3] pp. 350, 351; 3rd ed. p. 302.
[4] pp. 348, 352, 393; 3rd ed. pp. 300, 303, 338.
[5] pp. 350–355; 3rd ed. pp. 301—306.

whatever it may be, the Archdeacon, in maintaining such doctrine, is opposed to the testimony of almost all, if not all, the Liturgies of the Oriental Churches, and has, at the utmost, only the Romish canon of the Mass to fall back upon for his support. For though in the Oriental Churches there is an offering up of the elements, yet it takes place *before* their consecration is completed. For in those Churches the consecration is not supposed to be effected without the solemn invocation of the Holy Spirit to come down upon the elements to make them the Body and Blood of Christ. And this invocation is uttered *after* the offering up of the elements, and is not, in at least most, if any, of them, followed by any other presentation of them to God for his acceptance. At the time, therefore, when they are offered, they are not supposed to be even consecrated, and consequently no such notion as that put forward by Archdeacon Wilberforce could possibly have been entertained by those who used them. And the passages which he might urge or has urged from the Greek Fathers, speaking of an offering up of Christ's Body and Blood, when compared with the Liturgies which these Fathers were in the habit of using, instead of testifying in favor of the Archdeacon's views, are the best possible proof, that the Fathers used the terms "the Body and Blood of Christ" to denote the elements as *representing* that Body and Blood, and used them with reference to the elements even before their complete consecration, as being, as soon as they were placed upon the table, to a certain extent, that is, in purpose and intention, representatives of Christ's Body and Blood.

The testimony of many of the Fathers, particularly Irenæus, might be added to the same effect, namely, that the elements were offered as being bread and wine. But the evidence afforded by the Liturgies is so direct and unanswerable, that it is unnecessary to go further.

In the Roman Liturgy, indeed, there is no formal invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, and the consecration is supposed to be effected by the repetition of the words of institution; and in that Liturgy there is an offering up of the consecrated substances to God. But in this respect it stands nearly, if not quite, alone.

It is remarkable, that this palpable inconsistency of his views

with the remaining Liturgies of all the antient Churches[1] but one, namely, the Roman, seems never to have struck the Archdeacon. For it is, at once and alone, fatal to the notion of his views being those held by the majority of the orthodox portion of the early Church. They could not have held that there was any "offering up of Christ himself" in the Eucharist, because they did not offer up at all the *consecrated* elements.

There is one more remark also which I would offer in connexion with this point; and that is, that the Fathers, though they speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, do not hold that there is any proper sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood in it, but only a representation made of the sacrifice offered upon the Cross; which representation or memorial is, in a large sense, called a sacrifice; and is the only sacrifice which Christians are exhorted to make.

Thus in a passage already quoted in a previous page[2] from Eusebius of Cæsarea, we are told that our Lord directed us "to offer to God continually a memorial instead of a sacrifice."

And Theodoret says,—

"If, therefore, the priesthood that is according to the Law came to an end, and the priest that is according to the order of Melchisedeck offered a sacrifice, and rendered other sacrifices unnecessary, why do the priests of the New Testament perform the mystic service? But it is manifest to those who are instructed in Divine things, that we do not offer any other sacrifice, but perform *a memorial of that one and saving sacrifice.* For this the Lord himself commanded us, 'Do this in remembrance of me;' that by the contemplation we may recollect the example of the sufferings endured for us, and may inflame our love towards our benefactor and await the enjoyment of future blessings."[3]

[1] I use the word "Churches," because there is something in the Clementine Liturgy that might seem like an offering up of the elements after consecration. But this Liturgy does not appear to have been used in any Church. And to my mind the words do not appear to bear out the sense required to make it an exception.

[2] See p. 270 above.

[3] Εἰ τοίνυν καὶ ἡ κατὰ νόμον ἱερωσύνη τὸ τέλος ἐδέξατο, καὶ ὁ κατὰ τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς τὴν θυσίαν προσήνεγκε, καὶ θυσίας ἑτέρας ἀνενδεεῖς καθέστηκε, τί δήποτε τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης οἱ ἱερεῖς τὴν μυστικὴν λειτουργίαν ἐπιτελοῦσιν; Ἀλλὰ δῆλον τοῖς τὰ θεῖα πεπαιδευμένοις, ὡς οὐκ ἄλλην τινὰ θυσίαν προσφέρομεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς μιᾶς ἐκείνης καὶ σωτηρίου τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμῖν αὐτὸς ὁ Δεσπότης προσέταξε, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ἵνα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τὸν τύπον τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γεγενημένων ἀναμιμνησκώμεθα παθημάτων, καὶ τὴν περὶ

And so Chrysostom,—

"Do not we daily offer a sacrifice? We offer indeed, but *by making a memorial of his death*. . . . . This offering is in remembrance of that which was then made. For he says, 'This do in remembrance of me.' We do not offer another sacrifice, as the high priest then did, but always the same; OR RATHER WE MAKE A REMEMBRANCE OF THE SACRIFICE." [1]

The sacrifice is the making the memorial; so that after calling it a sacrifice, he, as it were, corrects himself, or at least shows that he uses the word in an improper sense, by adding, "*or rather we make a remembrance of the sacrifice.*"

Thus also Augustine says,—

"He is also our priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek, who offered himself a whole burnt offering for our sins, and *directed the similitude of his sacrifice to be celebrated in memory of his passion*, so that we see that which Melchisedek offered to God now offered in the Church of Christ throughout the whole world." [2]

The offering or sacrifice in this case is only the celebration of a representation of the one perfect and all-sufficient sacrifice in commemoration of it.

And hence he says in a passage already quoted above,[3]—

"The flesh and blood of this sacrifice, before the coming of Christ, was promised by victims of similitude; in the passion of Christ was rendered in very truth; after Christ's ascension is celebrated by *a sacrament of remembrance.*"

And therefore he tells us elsewhere, that "in the New Testament to eat bread is the sacrifice of Christians." [4]

τὸν εὐεργέτην ἀγάπην πυρσεύσωμεν, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν προσμένωμεν τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν. THEODORET. Comment. in Hebr. c. viii. vv. 4, 5. Op. iii. 594, 595.

[1] Ἡμεῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μεν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. . . . . Τοῦτο εἰς ἀνάμνησιν γίνεται τοῦ τότε γενομένου. Τοῦτο γὰρ ποιεῖτέ, φησιν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας. CHRYSOST. Comment. in Hebr. hom. xvii. § 3. Op. xii. 168, 169.

[2] Ipse est etiam sacerdos noster in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedec, qui se ipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, et ejus sacrificii similitudinem celebrandam in suæ passionis memoriam commendavit, ut illud quod Melchisedec obtulit Deo, jam per totum orbem terrarum in Christi Ecclesia videamus offerri. AUGUST. Lib. de divers. quæst. 83. quæst. 61. § 2. Op. vi. 25.

[3] See pp. 261, 262 above.

[4] Ideo hic dixit, 'Manducare panem;' quod est in Novo Testamento sacrificium Christianorum. ID. De Civ. Dei, lib. xvii. c. 5. Op. vii. 353.

And as the memorial is made through bread and wine, and the bread and wine are presented upon the Table to serve the purposes of the memorial, the Eucharist is sometimes called by them *the sacrifice of bread and wine;* as in the passage already quoted in a former page[1] from Fulgentius; who says that "the holy Catholic Church throughout the whole world ceases not to offer in faith and charity *the sacrifice of bread and wine,*" and that "in this sacrifice there is a thanksgiving and a *commemoration* of the flesh of Christ, which he offered for us, and of the blood which the same Divine Person shed for us."

But as it is only the memorial of a sacrifice, and therefore but improperly called a sacrifice, so far as concerns that which is on the Table, the early Fathers denied that they had any altars;[2] and to the accusation of Celsus on this account Origen replies,—

"He sees not that our altars are the mind of each of the righteous, from whence are sent up truly and intelligently incense offerings of sweet savour, even the prayers that proceed from a pure conscience."[3]

And hence Justin Martyr, speaking of the sacrifices of the New Testament mentioned by Malachi, says,—

"Prayers and thanksgivings made by the worthy are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God. These alone Christians have been taught to perform, both for a memorial of their food both as to meat and drink, and one in which a commemoration is made of the passion which the Son of God offered for them."[4]

To these few remarks and testimonies on the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as maintained by Archdeacon Wilberforce,

[1] See p. 273 above.

[2] See ORIG. Contra Cels. viii. § 17. Op. ed. Ben. i. 755. MIN. FELIX in Octav. § 32. ARNOB. adv. Gentes. vi. and vii.

[3] Οὐχ ὁρῶν, ὅτι βωμοὶ μὲν εἰσιν ἡμῖν τὸ ἑκάστου τῶν δικαίων ἡγεμονικὸν, ἀφ' οὗ ἀναπέμπεται ἀληθῶς καὶ νοητῶς εὐώδη θυμιάματα, αἱ προσευχαὶ ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως καθαρᾶς. ORIGEN. *ut supra.*

[4] "Οτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαι καὶ εὐχαριστίαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοι εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι· ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρας, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοῦ [αὐτοὺς] ὁ Θεὸς [υἱὸς] τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται. JUST. MART. Dial. cum Tryph. §§ 116, 117. Op. ed. Ben. Par. pp. 209, 210.

I have thought it well to call the attention of the reader in this place, because it is a point closely connected with that we have been discussing. But I have not felt it necessary to enter at any length into it; first, because, if there is any validity in the arguments of the preceding work, they overthrow the foundation on which it rests, the actual presence of Christ's Body and Blood in or under the elements; and secondly, because the indisputable fact, that in at least the far largest portion of the Christian Church the elements have not been offered up after consecration, negatives the possibility of such a doctrine being held in it to at least any extent.

B.

THE COMMUNION SERVICE CONTAINED IN WHAT ARE CALLED "THE CONSTITUTIONS OF THE APOSTLES," PRESERVED IN THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

I HAVE noticed in a former page[1] the above-mentioned Communion-Service, as one which is probably more antient than any other that remains to us, and as I think the reader may be glad to see it in its complete form, I here subjoin it entire, as given by Ludolf in his "Commentarius ad Historiam Æthiop. Francof. ad Mœn. 1691," fol. pp. 324—327. It occurs in the "Statuta Apostolorum apud Æthiopes," stat. 21, "De ordinatione Episcoporum et ritu Eucharistiæ."

"*Posteaquam constitutus est Episcopus, gratulantur ei omnes et singuli, ore osculantes eum qui factus est Episcopus. Et cui contigerit istud munus, Diaconus præbeat illi Eucharistiam. Adhæc ponens manum suam super panem eucharisticum cum omnibus presbyteris gratias agit Domino, dicens hoc modo:*

Dominus vobiscum omnibus.

Respondet Populus:

Totus cum Spiritu tuo sit.

Dicit Episcopus:

Elevate [sursum] corda.

[1] See pp. 460, 461 above.

Respondet omnis Populus :

Sunt apud Dominum Deum nostrum.

Dicit Episcopus :

Gratias agamus Domino.

Populus :

Rectus et justus est.

Deinde dicunt orationem eucharisticam, Episcopum præcuntem sequendo.

Gratias agimus tibi Domine per dilectum Filium tuum Jesum Christum, quem in ultimis diebus misisti nobis Salvatorem et Redemptorem, nuncium consilii tui. Iste [est] verbum quod ex te est, per quod omnia fecisti voluntate tua. Et misisti eum de cœlo in uterum virginis. Caro factus est, et gestatus fuit in ventre ejus : et Filius tuus manifestatus fuit a Spiritu Sancto, ut impleret voluntatem tuam : et populum tibi efficeret, expandendo manus suas : passus est, ut patientes [afflictos] liberaret, qui confidunt in te. Qui traditus est voluntate sua ad passionem, ut mortem dissolveret ; vincula Satanæ rumperet ; et conculcaret infernum, et sanctos educeret, et statuta conderet, et resurrectionem patefaceret. Accipiens ergo panem gratias egit, et dixit, *Accipite, comedite, Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis frangitur.* Et similiter calicem quoque et dixit, *Hic est sanguis meus, qui pro vobis effunditur, cum facitis hoc, in commemorationem mei id facietis.* Recordantes igitur mortis ejus et resurrectionis ejus offerimus tibi hunc panem et calicem, gratias agentes tibi, quod nos reddidisti dignos, ut stemus coram te, et sacerdotio tibi fungamur. Suppliciter oramus te, ut mittas Spiritum tuum Sanctum super oblationes hujus Ecclesiæ. Pariterque largiaris omnibus, qui sumunt de iis [ut prosit eis ad] sanctitatem : ut repleantur Spiritu Sancto, et ad confirmationem fidei in veritate, ut te celebrent et laudent in Filio tuo Jesu Christo, in quo tibi [sit] laus et potentia in sancta Ecclesia, et nunc et semper et in secula seculorum. Amen.

De oblatione olei.

Qui oleum offert tempore Eucharistiæ, ut et panem et vinum, gratias agit eodem modo. Quamvis autem iisdem verbis non fucrit usus, pro facultate sua propria etiam aliis verbis gratias agat, dicens :

Sanctificans oleum hoc, [gratiam] tribue illis qui unguntur, et accipiunt [panem et vinum] : sicuti unxisti sacerdotes et prophetas : similiter et illos, et unumquemque qui gustat [illud] corrobora : et sanctifica illos qui accipiunt illud.

Populus dicit :

Sicut erat, est, et erit in generationes generationum, et in secula seculorum. Amen.

Episcopus [*ait*]:

Iterum supplicamus, qui omnia continet, Domino omnipotenti, Patri Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, ut concedat nobis in benedictione accipere hoc sanctum sacramentum, utque neminem ex nobis reum faciat, [sed potius] omnes dignos reddat, qui sumunt et accipiunt sanctum sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi παντοκράτορος Domini Dei nostri.

Diaconus dicit: Orate.

Domine omnipotens, dum accipimus hoc sanctum mysterium, robur nobis tribue, neque quemquam ex nobis reum age, sed omnibus benedic in Christo; in quo tibi cum illo, et cum Spiritu Sancto [sit] laus et potentia [nunc] et semper, et in secula seculorum. Amen.

Diaconus dicit:

Vos qui statis, demittite capita vestra. Domine æterne, gnarus occultorum, declinaverunt tibi capita sua populus tuus, et tibi subjecerunt duritiem cordis et carnis. Respice de parata habitatione tua, et benedic illos et illas. Inclina illis aures tuas, et exaudi preces eorum. Corrobora [eos] virtute dextræ tuæ, et protege [eos] a passione mala. Custos eorum esto, tam corporis quam animæ. Auge et illis et nobis fidem et timorem. Per unicum Filium tuum, in quo tibi cum illo et cum Spiritu Sancto [sit] laus et potentia in perpetuum et in secula seculorum. Amen.

Diaconus ait: Respiciamus &c.

Et Episcopus: Sanctuarium Sanctis . . . .[1]

Populus respondet:

Unus Pater Sanctus: Unus Filius Sanctus: Unus est Spiritus Sanctus.

Episcopus dicit:

Dominus vobiscum omnibus.

Populus respondet:

Et cum Spiritu tuo.

Deinde attollunt hymnum laudis, et intrat populus, remedium animæ suæ quo peccatum remittitur, accipiens. [i. e. Communione utitur.]

Oratio postquam tradidit [Eucharistiam].

Domine παντοκράτωρ, Pater Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, gratias agimus tibi, quod concessisti nobis [ut] acciperemus de sancto tuo mysterio; ne sit nobis in reatum neque in damnati-

[1] Ludolf here adds the following note,—Hiatus hoc loco est in apographo meo.

onem, sed ad renovationem animæ, corporis et animi. Per unicum Filium tuum, in quo tibi cum illo, et cum Spiritu Sancto sit laus et potentia in perpetuum, et nunc et semper, et in secula seculorum. Amen.

Populus dicit: Amen.

Presbyter dicit:

Dominus sit cum vobis omnibus.

Impositio manuum postquam acceperunt [sacramentum].

Domine æterne, qui omnia regis, Pater Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, benedic servis tuis et ancillis tuis. Protege et adjuva et sospita [eos] virtute angelorum tuorum. Custodi et corrobora [eos] in timore tuo per Majestatem tuam: exorna [eos] ut quæ tua sunt, cogitent: et largire [eis] ut quæ tua sunt, credant, et ut quæ tua sunt, velint: concordiam sine peccato et ira gratificare illis. Per unicum Filium tuum, in quo tibi cum illo et cum Spiritu Sancto sit laus, et nunc, &c.

Populus respondet: Amen.

Episcopus dicit:

Dominus vobiscum omnibus.

Populus: Et cum Spiritu tuo.

Diaconus dicit:

Abite in pace.

Et post hæc absoluta est Eucharistia."

It will be observed, that not a word occurs here as to any change in the elements, nor are even the terms Body and Blood of Christ used as we find them used in the subsequent Liturgies.

C.

ON THE SUBSCRIPTION TO THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION REQUIRED OF GERMANS ORDAINED BY THE ANGLICAN BISHOP AT JERUSALEM.

IT may, perhaps, be worth while to notice here an argument that has been raised in favor of the admissibility of Archdeacon Denison's doctrine in our Church, from one of the directions issued to the Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem. The argument was stated in the course of the Archdeacon's trial at Bath, in

this form; namely, that according to the Statute 5 Vict. c. 6. under which the Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem was consecrated, Germans ordained by him are, before ordination, to sign the Augsburg Confession, as well as the XXXIX. Articles, and that as that Confession maintains what is commonly called the doctrine of Consubstantiation, the maintenance of such a doctrine is not inconsistent with subscription to those Articles.

The argument, in this form, is altogether incorrect, for the Statute says nothing on the subject. So far, therefore, as the Law of the land is concerned, which alone could give *authority* to such a direction, there is nothing to justify it. Nor is there any notice of such a direction in the Queen's Licence for Consecration.

But among the regulations prescribed by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in conjunction with others interested in the foundation of the Bishopric, for the guidance of the Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem, occurs the following direction;—"Germans intended for the charge of such congregations [i. e. 'congregations, consisting of Protestants of the German tongue, residing within the limits of the Bishop's jurisdiction'] are to be ordained according to the ritual of the English Church, and to sign the Articles of that Church; and, in order that they may not be disqualified by the laws of Germany from officiating to German congregations, they are, before ordination, to exhibit to the Bishop a certificate of their having subscribed, before some competent authority, the Confession of Augsburg." [1]

The sole authority, therefore, for such a practice is, a regulation made by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in conjunction with a few other individuals consulted by him on the matter. If, therefore, Archdeacon Denison wishes to be consistent, he must at once drop the notion of referring to such a regulation as having any authority in our Church, unless he is prepared to concede the same power to the present and all future Primates. Even supposing that the argument in itself was a sound one, it would have no more weight than the private

[1] Statement of Proceedings relating to the Establishment of a Bishopric of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem. Published by authority. Lond. 1841. 8vo. pp. 8, 9.

opinion of two or three individuals could give it. Legally it amounts to nothing.

But further, the argument itself is not valid.

In the first place, it is perfectly clear from the wording of the regulation, that those who drew it up did not bear in mind at the time, that there are *two* Confessions going under the name of the Augsburg Confession, namely, the original Confession of 1530, and the *Confessio Variata* (as it is called) published by Melancthon in 1540. And in the latter Confession, which is the one adopted in many places in Germany, the Article on the Lord's Supper was altered for the purpose of removing the difficulty which *some*, who did not hold the doctrine of Consubstantiation, felt in subscribing the Confession of 1530. And it was fully admitted on behalf of Archdeacon Denison, that this latter Confession does not express the doctrine of Consubstantiation. So that, as far as concerns the Augsburg Confession, according to the recension of it by Melancthon in 1540, the argument falls to the ground. For it is admitted, that subscription to it does not commit any one to the maintenance of what is called the doctrine of Consubstantiation.

And this might be the Confession intended to be referred to. Certainly, in the *first* edition of the "Sylloge Confessionum," published at Oxford, this was the only one given as the Augsburg Confession.

But even if we take the Confession of 1530 as the one referred to, the argument also fails; for that Confession was signed by multitudes who did not hold Consubstantiation, but rejected and opposed it. I might give copious proofs of this, but a few will be sufficient for our present purpose.

Thus, then, speaks one who had entered more fully into the depths of the Sacramentarian controversy than probably any other man, and was a decided Anti-Lutheran, I mean Hospinian. After quoting the tenth Article of the first Confession of Augsburg,[1] he remarks as follows:—

"Hæc verba, licet brevia, ambigua propter generalitatem, et ob-

[1] This Article stands thus,—De Cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint: et cum pane et vino distribuantur vescentibus in Cœna Domini; et improbant secus docentes.

scura, *nihil continent, quod nostræ sententiæ adversetur.* Non enim negarunt unquam nostri, Corpus Christi vere adesse in sua cœna. Sic enim Zuinglius in Expositione fidei ad regem Galliæ: 'Christum,' inquit, 'credimus vere esse in cœna: imo non credimus esse Domini cœnam nisi Christus adsit. Sed hinc non sequitur, Christum, vel corpus Christi esse in pane, aut in loco quo est panis. Neque non adest vere, quod adest secundum promissiones divinas, nobis operatione Spiritus Sancti communicatum et unitum.' Distribuitur etiam vescentibus, dum sua unicuique panis particula data singulis totus et idem Christus communicatur." [1]

It is obvious, indeed, that there is an ambiguity in the words, from the different senses that may be given to the word either by man or God. If it is taken to mean that *the minister* "distribuantur;" for that word may be applied to what is done gives the Body and Blood of Christ to the communicants, it speaks *only* the language of Luther; but if it is taken to signify that that Body and Blood are given *from above*, it is language that might well be used by those who altogether opposed the doctrine of Consubstantiation. And this ambiguity was probably intended, in order to meet the difference of view among those who drew it up.

And on the words "Secus docentes improbant," Hospinian adds,—

"Sed et hoc nostri non minus faciunt quam illi. Improbant enim Swenkfeldii et Anabaptistarum doctrinam, nuda, vacua et inania tantum signa statuentes. Nec minus improbant Ubiquistarum glossas et interpretationes verborum hujus articuli, quod nimirum, Vere adesse Christum in sua cœna, idem sit quod corporaliter adesse in vel sub pane, vel in loco panis. Item, Distribui vescentibus in Cœna Domini, idem esse, quod Corpus Christi in singulorum vescentium, fidelium et infidelium ora vel corpora, una cum pane tradi et accipi. Ubi enim quicquam istorum in Confessione legitur?" [2]

And all the other parts of the Confession he claims as clearly speaking his doctrine, observing:—

"Adhæc omnia alia Confessionis, in quibus de sacramentis agitur,

[1] Hospinian. Histor. Sacram. Pt. ii. p. 157. Genev. 1681. fol.
[2] Id. ib. p. 157.

nostrorum sententiam de cœna confirmant, et Lutheranorum seu Ubiquistarum interpretationem manifeste excludunt." [1]

And this he proceeds to prove by various passages, and then concludes thus:—

"Non rejiciunt igitur nostri Confessionem Augustanam, ejusque decimum articulum de Cœna Domini, in sano, vero, recto, pio et catholico sensu, quem Patres et omnes Sancti in Ecclesia Christi semper amplexi sunt; nempe, quod in Cœna Domini una cum pane et vino, hoc est, dum sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini percipitur, vere etiam exhibeantur ipsum corpus et sanguis Domini fide percipienda. Dum enim *ministri* sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi distribuunt, *Christus ipse* sese impartit spiritualiter fruendum, ut pii communionem cum ipso habeant, et in ipso vivant." [2]

He then proceeds to explain that what he and his party rejected was the sense put upon the Augsburg Confession by the Papists, and also the sense put upon it by Luther, and that they adopted a sense grounded upon better authority; observing,—

"Rejiciunt nostri illum sensum quo Lutherus decimum articulum intellexit. Non enim sequitur, Lutherus et multi alii hunc articulum sic intellexit; ergo sic intelligi debet. Sicut non sequitur, vel Ubiquistis testibus, Ecclesiæ superioris Germaniæ et Philippus paulo post melius edoctus intellexerunt, et nostri intelligunt eam, aliter; ergo aliter intelligenda est. Sed hujus demum argumenti veritas et consequentia firma est,—Sic postulant eam Scriptura intelligi, et vetus Ecclesia, cujus testimoniis suam sententiam explicat et astringit Confessio, et cum qua consentire eam inter nos utrinque in confesso est: et sic postulant eam intelligi verba et partes ipsius Confessionis et Apologiæ inter se collatæ: sic denique subsecutæ interpretationes, emendationes, repetitiones, declarationes ab iis qui primum obtulerunt Confessionem, et ab iis qui postea ad eam accesserunt, approbatæ, et ab ipso scriptore August. Confessionis, et quem authenticum ejus esse interpretem ipsi Lutherani fatentur, inde ab anno primæ editionis usque ad ejus vitæ finem constanter traditæ, solidisque rationibus munitæ: ergo sic intelligenda est, nec a quoquam, quicunque is sit, alius ei sensus affingendus est, nisi a Scriptura, a veteris Ecclesiæ symbolis et doctrina, a Philippo, et a seipsa Confessionem avellere velimus." [3]

[1] Id. ib. p. 157. [2] Id. ib. p. 158. [3] Id. ib. pp. 158, 159.

Not only, therefore, does he maintain that the Augsburg Confession may be subscribed by them, but contends, on all these grounds, that the sense they put upon its words was the true and legitimate sense of them.

And the "Formula Concordiæ" itself, drawn up by the *high* Lutheran divines in 1577, bears unwilling witness, that some of the Lutherans themselves at that time openly held the doctrine of the sacramentaries,[1] (as they were called,) and maintained that the Augsburg Confession was altogether in favor of that doctrine,[2] and of course rebukes them for so doing.[3] And chiefly on account of the ground it took on this point this "Form of Concord" was a fruitful source of confusion and discord for many years in the Lutheran Churches.

To the same effect speaks Calvin himself more than once:—

"Nec vero Augustanam Confessionem repudio, cui pridem volens ac libens subscripsi, sicuti eam auctor ipse [i. e. Melancthon] interpretatus est."[4]

"Ego certe in eorum numero sum, qui Augustanam Confessionem sequi et probare volunt, cum in aliis omnibus, tum etiam in illo capite quod est de Cœna Domini!"[5]

And certainly one evidence that this Confession does not commit its subscribers to the doctrine of Consubstantiation, is found in the following statement quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce himself from Lücke:—"Since the middle of the 18th "century, the *generality*, whether of dogmatic or exegetical "writers *among the Lutherans*, have at first silently, and then "avowedly, adopted the Calvinistic or Zuinglian theory of the "Lord's Supper."[6]

It is clear, therefore, that a subscription to either of these

[1] Non clam tantum et occulte, sed partim etiam aperte ad Sacramentarios defecerunt.

[2] Quasi ea cum Sacramentariorum doctrina in hoc articulo per omnia faceret.

[3] Formula Concord. Pt. 2. loc. 7. *init.* Inter Libr. Symbol. Eccles. Luth. ed. Hase, Lips. 1846. p. 725.

[4] CALVIN. Epist. ad Mart. Schaling. Inter Epist. in Oper. Amstel. 1667. tom. ix. Pt. 2. p. 113.

[5] ID. Ad illustr. princ. quend. German. ib. p. 148.

[6] Lücke Comment. on St. John, vol. ii. p. 732, as cited by Archd. Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 130; or, 3rd ed. p. 111.

Confessions does not commit the subscriber to the doctrine of Consubstantiation. And consequently the requirement in question does not at all prove that our Articles are consistent with that doctrine. The Confession of Augsburg (whichever of the two is meant) and the XXXIX. Articles may *both* be subscribed by one who denies that doctrine. The question, therefore, whether the maintenance of such a doctrine is consistent with a subscription to the XXXIX. Articles, is not affected by the regulation referred to.

Printed by C. F. Hodgson, 1 Gough Square, Fleet Street, London.

SUPPLEMENT

TO

MR. GOODE'S WORK ON THE EUCHARIST.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON,
GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET

A

SUPPLEMENT TO HIS WORK ON THE EUCHARIST;

CONTAINING

TWO LETTERS OF BISHOP GESTE

(ONE HITHERTO UNKNOWN)

FROM THE STATE PAPER OFFICE,

ILLUSTRATING

THE HISTORY AND MEANING OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH AND TWENTY-NINTH ARTICLES;

TOGETHER WITH

A REPLY TO DR. PUSEY'S ANSWER,
AND A FEW REMARKS ON THE ATTEMPTS MADE BY ARCHDEACON DENISON AND OTHERS TO DISCREDIT THAT WORK WITHOUT ANSWERING IT.

By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.,
Rector of St. Margaret Lothbury, London.

LONDON:
THOMAS HATCHARD, 187, PICCADILLY.

1858.

A SUPPLEMENT,

&c. &c.

A Letter of Bishop Geste which has recently been put forth, found in the State Paper Office, has been appealed to as determining the sense of the 28th Article in a direction very different from that which has been ordinarily attributed to it. The question thus raised may, I think, be easily set at rest, and the interpretation thus given to the 28th Article be shown to be inadmissible, by another letter of the same Bishop, which I have found in the same repository.

The former Letter (as printed by Archdeacon Denison's publisher) is as follows :—

The Letter of Geste, Bishop of Rochester, to Cecil, Secretary to Queen Elizabeth, etc., 22nd December, 1566, from the original in the State Paper Office :—

"Greeting in ye Lord.

"Right Honourable—I am verye sorye yt you are so sicke, God make you whole, as it is my desyer and prayer. I wold have seen you er this, accordinge to my duetye and good will, but when I sent to knowe whether I might see you it was often answered yt you were not to be spoken with.

"I suppose you have hard how ye Bisshop of Glocestre [*i. e.* Cheney] found him selue greeved with ye plasynge of this adverbe *onely* in this article, 'The body of Christ is gyven taken and eaten in ye Supper after an heavenly and spirituall maner onely' bycause it did take awaye ye presence of Christis Bodye in ye Sacrament, and prively noted me to take his part therein, and yeasterdaye in myn absence more playnely vouched me for ye same. Whereas

betwene him and me, I told him plainelye that this word *onelye* in ye foresaied Article did not exclude ye presence of CHRISTIS Body fro the Sacrament, but onely ye grossenes and sensiblenes in ye receavinge thereof: For I saied vnto him *though he tooke Christis Bodye in his hand, receaved it with his mouthe, and that corporally naturally reallye substantially and carnally* as ye doctors doo write, *yet did he not for all that see it, feale it, smelle it, nor tast it.* And therefore I told him I wold speake against him herein, and ye rather bycause ye Article was of myn owne pennynge. And yet I wold not for all that denye therebye any thing that I had spoken for ye presence. And this was ye some of our talke.

"And this that I saied is so true by all sortes of men that even D. Hardinge writeth ye same as it appeareth most evidently by his wordes reported in ye Busshoppe of Salisburie's [Jewel's] booke pagina 325, wich be thees: 'Then ye maye saye yt in ye Sacrament His verye Body is present yea really that is to saye, in deede, substantially that is in substance, and corporally carnally and naturally, by ye wich words is ment that His verye Bodye His verye flesh and His verye humane nature is there not after corporall carnall or naturall wise, but invisibly unspeakeably supernaturally spiritually divinely and by waye unto Him onlye knowen.'" [See Jewel's controversy with Harding, Art. v., Divis. v., p. 455, Park. Soc. ed.]

"This I thought good to write to your honour for myn owne purgation. The Almightye GOD in CHRIST restore you to your old health, and longe kepe you in ye same with encrease of vertue and honour.

"Yours whole to his poore pow^{r}

"EDM. ROFFEN."

"To ye right honourable and his singler
good friend Sir Willm Cecill Knight
Principall Secretaire to ye Queens Ma^{tie}."

From this letter it seems, that the words, "the body of Christ," &c., inserted in the 28th Article in the revision of 1562, were proposed by Bishop Geste, and proposed by him (with a subtilty to be regretted) under the notion that they admitted his doctrine of the presence of our Lord's body in the elements.

This is the utmost that the advocates of Bishop Geste's doctrine of the presence can extract from this letter in their favour.

Now, under some circumstances, it might have been difficult to show, that those who agreed to the Articles in the Convocation of 1562, did not use these words in the same sense as that attached to them by Bishop Geste. But fortunately these Articles were passed in Convocation with the *addition of another,* namely the 29th, which I shall now show, *by Bishop Geste's own testimony,* to be entirely irreconcileable with his view of the presence, and which therefore excludes his interpretation of the 28th. And accordingly we find that he did not subscribe the Articles in the Convocation of 1562. (See Lamb's Historical Account of the XXXIX. Articles.)

Previous to the *publication* of Article 29, by *authority,* in 1571, it might, no doubt, have been urged, that though this Article had been subscribed by Convocation, and therefore showed the doctrine of the subscribing Bishops and Clergy, yet that, as it had not the Royal authority, and therefore was not published, it could not be taken into account. But since the publication of that Article with the rest, by the authority not only of the Queen but Parliament also, in 1571, no sense can be placed on Article 28, which is not consistent with the doctrine delivered in Article 29.

Now what Bishop Geste himself held to be the doctrine maintained in Article 29, he himself shall inform us: as also how far he would have been glad subsequently to modify the phraseology of Article 28.

Among the Papers preserved in the State Paper Office is a letter to Lord Burleigh, written just after the XXXIX. Articles had been agreed to in Convocation in 1571, and placed before Queen Elizabeth for her judgment on them, in which exception is taken to several passages that occur in them, and particularly to the 29th Article. There is no signature attached to the letter, but a moment's comparison of it with the letter of Bishop Geste, given above, which has his signature to it, and which is also in the State Paper Office, shows beyond the possibility of a doubt that both are by the

ame hand. The handwriting is of that distinctive character which at once proves the identity of the writer of the two letters, to say nothing of the internal testimony.

The letter occurs in the Series of MSS. entitled "Domestic —Elizabeth," under the year 1571, vol. 78, No. 36. There is no date to the letter, but a note in a modern hand conjectures that it was written "1571. May prob." to which date the internal testimony, noticing the excommunication of Cheney, and the passing of the Articles through Convocation, clearly points.

The letter is as follows :—

"To y^e^ right honourable & his verye good Lorde
L of Burleye etc.

"I am bold to trouble your good Lordshippe ones agayne for unitie in sound & true ~~ling~~[1] doctrine. Ffor never was there better occasion when to performe it then nowe. Bycause y^e^ Bisshoppes have gyven uppe y^e^ booke of articles to y^e^ Quenes ma^tie^ to peruse them and judge them. I have writen my mynde to your L. of some of y^e^ articles that y^e^ saied unitie might be performed and set forthe, knowynge you as willinge theunto as my selfe.

"*Notes.*

"1. It is writen in y^e^ begynnynge of y^e^ article of predestination as it is in Latin thus : Predestinatio ad vitam. . .

. . . . . .

[Then follow various remarks on this and other Articles, suggesting *alterations,* and finding fault with the limitation of the sacraments to *two,* and proposing that instead of the words, "These five commonly called sacraments," &c., should be inserted the following,—"Confirmation penance order matrimonye & extreme annoylinge are not to be taken for such sacramentes as baptisme and y^e^ Lordes Supper be, bycause none of them hathe appoynted of god the visible signe of his heathfull [healthfull] grace, and all of them save penance want that grace. And so they are not to be accompted for suche sacramentes as baptisme and y^e^ Lordes Supper are wiche have bothe y^e^ signe and goddes healthefull

[1] Sic in MS.

grace, ordeyned of god to be signified & gyven by it"; and then the writer proceeds as follows] :—

"8. In ye Article of ye Lordes Supper it is thus saied. The bodye of Christ is gyven taken & eaten in ye Supper after a heavenlye & spuall maner onely. Thoughe it be true, that ye bodye of Christ can not be gyven taken & eaten in his supper, but it must nedes be truely gyven taken and eaten in ye supper, yet bycause some men for a more playnes wold have added this worde truely or in-dede, in this wise, The body of Christ is in dede gyven taken & eaten in ye supper, it were well to putt it in, and Calvine agreethe thereunto for thus he writethe in his comentaries upon these wordes of Poule, hoc est corpus meu. Concludo realiter ut vulgo loquutur, hoc est vere nobis dari in cena corpus Christi. And my L. of Sarisburie hath thees wordes. That we verelye & undoubtedly receave Christis bodye in ye sacrament it is neither denyed, nor in question.

"9. In that, in ye booke it is further saied after a spirituall & heavenly maner onely some be offended withe this worde onely, as my L. of Glocester, as thoughe this worde onely did take awaye ye reall presence of Christis bodye, or ye receavinge of ye same by ye mouthe, whereas it was putt in onely to this ende, to take awaye all grosse & sensible presence, for it is verye true that when Christis bodye is taken & eaten, it is neither seen felt, smelt nor tasted to be Christis body, and so it is receaved & eaten but after a heavely & spirituall & no sensible maner. And whereas it is saied bycause ye mouthe receavethe Christis bodye, therefore it is sensibly receaved, The consequent is not true bycause ye mouthe in receavinge Christis bodye, doeth not feele it nor taste it, nor we by any other sence do perceave it. Yet for all this to avoyde offence & contention ye worde onely maye be well left out, as not nedefull. My L. of Glocester is pronouced excomunicate by my lorde of Canterburie & shall be cited to answer before him, and other bishoppes to certein errours whiche he is accused to holde. I think if this worde onely were put out of ye booke for his sake it were ye best.

"10. It foloweth in ye booke, But ye meane whereby ye bodye of Christ is receaved & eaten in ye supper is faithe. If this worde profitably were put hereunto in this sort, But ye meane whereby ye body of Christ is profitably receaved & eaten in ye supper is faith, then shuld the occasion of this question, whether ye evill do receave Christis body in ye sacrament, bycause they lacke faithe (wiche risethe of ye forsaied wordes & causethe miche strife) shuld be quyte taken awaye, for that hereby is not denyed the unfrutefull receavinge of Christis body without faithe but ye frutefull onely affirmed.

My L. grace of Canterburie is purposed to present to ye Quenes Matie ye first copie of ye booke of articles (to the wiche ye most part of bishops have subscribed) to have it authorised by Her Matie, and there is this article.

"11. Evill men receave not ye bodye of Christ, which article is not in ye prynted bookes either Laten or Englishe. If this article be confirmed and authorised by ye Quenes grace it will cause muche busynes, bycause it is quyte contrarie to ye scripture & to ye doctrine of ye fathers, for it is certein that Judas as evill as he was did receave Christis bodye, bycause Christ saied unto him take eate this is my bodye. It is not saied, if thou be a good or a faithefull man, take eate this is my bodye, but simply without any suche condition, take eate this is my bodye. So that to all men wiche be of ye churche & of the profession of Christ, whether they be good or bad, faithfull or unfaythefull (for to them onely Christ spoke thees wordes take eate this is my body and not to ye jewe turke, miscreant beast or birde) Christis body is gyven & they do receave it. That is ye cause that poule saith whosoever shall eate of this breade & dryncke of ye cuppe of ye Lorde unworthely, shall be giltie of ye bodye & bloude of ye Lorde, for he that eatethe or drynkethe unworthely eatethe & drynketh his owne dañation, bycause he makethe no difference of ye Lordes body. Note well thees wordes ye Lordes body. It [sic] not here saied ye signe or sacrament of ye Lordes body nor ye grace or fruite of the Lordes bodye, nor ye memorie of the Lordes

Math. 20.

1 Cor. 11.

passion, but plainely y^e^ Lordes bodye, to teache us that y^e^ evill men of the churche doo receave Christes bodye. Therefore Theodoretus (that anciant father) in his cōmentarie upon ye saied wordes thus writethe, Illud autē, Erit reus corporis et sanguinis domini, hoc significat, quod quēadmodu tradidit ipsū Judas, Ipsi autem insultaverūt et eum probris et convitiis affecerūt Judei, Ita eum ignominia et dedecore afficiūt, qui sanctissimum ejus corpus immundis manibus accipiūt, et in pollutū incestuque os imittūt. God grant us unitie in true & sounde doctrine for Christis sake. Amen."

Here, then, we have Bishop Geste's own testimony as to the meaning of the 29th Article, and consequently that the introduction of that Article was fatal to his mode of interpreting the 28th. Even if he himself penned the words "after a heavenly and spiritual manner only," with the secret intention of understanding them as he has explained them in his Letter to Cecil of Dec. 22, 1566, *the addition of the 29th Article was fatal to their being received in that sense.* And when we recollect that the 29th Article was among the Articles that were passed by the Convocation of 1562 (though *then* struck out of them, probably by the Queen, before they were published with the Royal authorization), we at once see, that the meaning attached to the words of the 28th Article by Bishop Geste was not that in which they were passed by Convocation. And no doubt the introduction of the 29th Article was the reason why the Articles of 1562 were not subscribed by Bishop Geste. Even irrespective of that addition, it would seem that the words appeared to others to enunciate so clearly a different doctrine from that which Bishop Geste ascribed to them, that even Bishop Cheney, who would have been glad to have subscribed them in that sense, could not conscientiously do so. And Bishop Geste himself, on second thoughts, would have liked to eliminate the word "only," *in order to save Cheney from condemnation;* which shows that Parker and the Bishops before whom he was convened did not interpret the word in the sense

attached to it by Geste. But after that addition was made, Bishop Geste's own statement as to the character of that addition shows that the 28th, if it is to harmonize with the 29th, must be differently interpreted.

The attempts that have recently been made to explain away the meaning of the 29th Article might safely be left to fall by their own weight. But if any additional evidence were wanting to the plain witness the words themselves bear to their own meaning, it might certainly be found in this Letter of Bishop Geste.

It is worthy of remark, also, that the very word which Archdeacon Denison would wish us to suppose is to be *understood* in the interpretation of the words, that we receive the body of Christ by faith only, namely "profitably," was *proposed for insertion by Bishop Geste,* but was *not inserted.*

How different were the views of Bishop Geste on this point from those of Bishop Jewel, may be seen by comparing the way in which the former notices the passage he has quoted from Harding, and the remarks of the latter on the same passage. Bishop Geste, as we have seen, quotes it as conformable to his own doctrine. But this very same passage is treated by Bishop Jewel in the following way:—

"M. Harding saith, these words, 'This is my body,' must needs be taken without metaphor, trope, or figure, even as the plain letter lieth, and none otherwise. So saith M. Harding only upon his own credit. But the old Catholic doctors of the Church, of whom he saith he hath such store, say not so. St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Hierome, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, Tertullian, and others, call the Sacrament a figure, a token, a sign, an example, an image, a similitude, a remembrance. . . . [And then having pointed out the nature of the exposition given by the Romanists of the words of institution, he proceeds thus:] Upon these grounds of his own M. Harding reareth up this conclusion: 'Then,' saith he, 'may we say, that Christ is in the Sacrament really,' &c. Indeed a man may say much, that hath no regard what he say. But if he will say, as the old godly fathers said, then must he say: *Hoc est corpus meum, hoc est, figura corporis mei:* 'This is my body, that is to say, a figure of my body.' For so the old learned father Tertullian saith. . . . Here M. Harding, seeing the

inconveniences and absurdities of his doctrine, thought good to heal it up with some plaister. By these words, really, carnally, &c., 'the godly learned fathers,' saith he, 'meant that Christ's very body and flesh is there, but not in any natural or carnal wise.' *And thus M. Harding's doctors wrote one thing and meant another....* But what are these old learned fathers, that say Christ's body is thus really and fleshly in the Sacrament? Where be their words? What be their names? If they have neither names nor words, how can they be allowed for sufficient witnesses? M. Harding well knoweth that the old learned fathers *never said so;* yet must he needs imagine both causes that moved them so to say, and also expositions what they meant by so saying." [1]

That Bishop Geste, almost immediately after penning the above letter to Lord Burleigh, should subscribe the Articles, including the 29th, is, I suppose, to be accounted for from what some modern writers would style, "the necessities of his position;" but it is a fact which does not seem very creditable to his candour. It did not, however, go without its reward, for by the end of the year he was promoted to Salisbury.

That Archbishop Parker disagreed with Bishop Geste in his view of the doctrine of the Eucharist, is clear from the part which the Archbishop took with respect to the 29th Article. The Archbishop, in his letter to Lord Burleigh, of June 4, 1571,[2] expressly defends the 29th Article against those who had endeavoured to prejudice him against it. And a still further testimony of his views may be found in a work which he published, containing an Anglo-Saxon homily on the Lord's Supper.[3] In a preface to this homily, signed by Archbishop Parker and the Arch-

[1] Jewel's Reply to Harding, Art. V. div. 5. pp. 455—7, Park. Soc. ed.

[2] See Parker's Correspondence, P. S. ed. p. 381.

[3] This work was entitled, "A testimonie of antiquitie, shewing the "auncient fayth in the Church of England touching the sacrament of the body "and bloude of the Lord here publikely preached, and also receaved in the "Saxons tyme, above 600 yeares agoe. Imprinted at London by John Day." 4to. Without date, but first printed about the year 1566, and a second edition between that year and 1570.

bishop of York, and thirteen other bishops (but not by Geste or Cheney), after a condemnatory notice of some things in this homily, "as where it speaketh of the Masse to "be profitable to the quicke and dead; of the mixture of "water with wyne; and whereas here is also made reporte "of two vayne miracles," it is said in the way of commendation, that "the full and whole discourse of all the former "part of the sermon, and almost of the whole sermon, is "about the understanding of the sacramentall bread and "wine howe it is the bodye and bloude of Christ our "Saviour, by which is revealed and made knowen, what "hath been the common taught doctrine of the Church of "England on this behalfe many hundreth yeares agoe, con-"trarye unto the unadvised writyng of some nowe a dayes."

Now, the doctrine of the homily, in the part here referred to with comparative approbation, is undeniably not that of a real presence of Christ's body in or under the elements, but that the elements become in a mystical and spiritual sense Christ's body and blood, as having a spiritual power and influence imparted to them. This is not precisely the doctrine of our best divines, for, as Hooker says, the sacraments "are "not really, nor do really contain in themselves that grace "which, with them or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow. "If on all sides it be confessed, that the grace of baptism is "poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it, "although it be neither seated in the water, nor the water "changed into it, what should induce men to think that the "grace of the Eucharist must needs be in the Eucharist "before it can be in us that receive it?"[1] But it is very different from what is called the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the difference between it and the sounder doctrine delivered by Hooker is, *comparatively*, of secondary importance.

The following extracts will show clearly what the doctrine of the homily is:—

"Now several men have often searched, and do yet often search,

[1] Eccl. Pol. V. lxvii. 6.

howe bread that is gathered of corne, and through fyer's heate baked, may bee turned to Christes body, or how wyne that is pressed out of many grapes is turned through any blessing to the Lorde's bloude. Now saye we to suche men, that *some thinges be spoken of Christ by signification, some by thyng certaine.* True thyng is and certaine, that Christ was borne of a maide, and suffred death of his own accorde, and was buried, and on thys daye rose from death. He is sayd bread by signification, and a lambe, and a lyon, and so forth. He is called bread, because he is our life and angells life. He is sayd to be a lambe for his innocencie: a lyon for strength, wherwith he overcame the strong devill. But Christ is not so notwithstanding after true nature, neither bread, nor a lambe, nor a lyon. Why is then the holy housel called Christ's body, or his bloud, if it be not truely that it is called? Truely the bread and the wine which by the masse of the priest be halowed, *shewe one thyng without to humayne understanding and an other thing they call within to beleving minds.* Without they bee sene bread and wine both in figure and in tast: but they be truely after the halowing Christes body and hys bloude *through ghostly mistery.* . . . Much is betwixte the invisible myghte of the holye housel, and the visible shape of hys proper nature. It is naturally corruptible bread and corruptible wine: and is by myghte of God's worde truely Christes bodye and hys bloude: *not so notwithstanding bodely, but ghostly.* Much is betwixte the body Christ suffred in, and the bodye that is halowed to housell. The body truely that Christ suffered in was borne of the flesh of Mary, with bloud and with bone, with skinne and with synowes, in humane limmes, with a reasonable soule living: and his ghostlye body, whiche we call the housell, is gathered of many cornes: without bloude and bone, without lymme and without soule: and therfore *nothing is to be understoode therein bodelye; but all is ghostlye to be understode.* Whatsoever is in that housell, whiche geveth substance of lyfe, that is of the ghostlye might, and invisible doing. Therfore is the holy housel called a misterye, because there is one thing in it seene, and an other thing understode. That which is ther sene, hath bodely shape: and that we do there understand, hath ghostlye might." [1]

[1] I quote from the reprint, in "Select Monuments of the doctrine and worship of the Catholic Church in England before the Norman Conquest. Lond. 1849." 12mo. pp. 15—23.

As to the doctrine contained in these passages, there cannot, I suppose, be a question.

Another testimony that the Bishops of that day did not hold the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements, may be found in the fact that Campian, one of the Romish divines of that period, speaks of Cheney as more tolerable than the rest of the heretics, and distinguished from them *as holding the true presence of Christ on the altar,* and the free will of man, and not persecuting the Catholics in his diocese; and thus as being the abomination of the heretics and the shame of the Catholics.[1]

And Camden speaks of Cheney as distinguished from his brethren by being *Luthero addictissimum,* a warm adherent of Luther.

The use made of Bishop Geste's Letter of 1566, having induced me to publish these few remarks on his case, and show its bearing upon the interpretation to be given to the Articles, I think it well to add, before I conclude, some observations on the adverse criticism that has been put forth from some quarters on my work on the Eucharist. With the exception of the incomplete work of Dr. Pusey on the subject,[2] none that I have seen appear to have any other object in view than that of misrepresenting and discrediting the work; an object easy to accomplish, in any case, with those readers who look only to the works published on their own side of the question. And as such readers form a large proportion of those who read at all, such productions often answer their purpose and accomplish their intended end. Dr. Pusey's work is only a fragment of his intended and promised answer, and leaves

[1] Hæreticorum odium, Catholicorum pudor . . . Quis vidêre? quid expectas? quæ tua vita est? et quam in eo tibi spem restare putas, quod hæretici implacabili odio convitiisque lacessant? quod ex omnibus hæresiarchis tolerabilius insanias? quod veram Christi præsentiam in altari, et liberum hominis arbitrium profiteare? quod Catholicorum neminem in tua Diœcesi protriveris? Edm. Campiani Epist. Rich. Cheneo, inter Opusc. Antw. 1631. 12mo. pp. 364, 365.

[2] Entitled, "The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ the Doctrine of the English Church, &c. Oxf. 1857." 8vo.

some of the most important points in the controversy untouched. But it may be well that I should at once offer a few remarks on the matters he has taken up.

In my work on the Eucharist I have so fully discussed all the various points connected with the subject, and Dr. Pusey's reply is so far from any attempt to meet my arguments and authorities as a whole, even on the points he has noticed, that to give the reader any idea of the strength of the case against Dr. Pusey would necessitate the reproduction of the greater part of my work. I must request the reader, therefore, to compare our arguments and authorities as given in our respective works, and shall content myself with a brief notice of those points in which Dr. Pusey's statements might be likely to mislead him. One caution I would premise at the outset, and one of which I am convinced any thoughtful reader of Dr. Pusey's works on this subject will at once see the justice, namely, that a very large portion of those works consists of statements which, while forming part of his argument, *beg the whole question,* their applicability and force depending wholly upon the meaning of certain *terms* used in them, *the proper interpretation of which forms one of the great points at issue.* For instance, the words "the Holy Eucharist," "the Sacrament," "the Lord's Body," are all used by Dr. Pusey as necessarily bearing the sense he attaches to them, and passages in which they occur in other authors are quoted as testimonies in his favor, when in fact the proper meaning to be attached to these phrases is the chief point in dispute. After Consecration the bread may be very properly called "the Lord's Body," as being so representatively and symbolically, by those who are wholly opposed to the notion of the real Body of our Lord being present in or under it. Dr. Pusey may intend to be very honest in the matter; but the effect of his following such a course is, that whatever success he obtains with his readers in such a way, is obtained, not by valid arguments, but by deluding and mystifying them.

Dr. Pusey devotes his Preface to a notice of my answer to his argument from the Fathers, especially that part of it which is grounded on the fact, that the Fathers themselves

tell us, that it is customary to call the *signs* in the Eucharist by *the names of the things signified,* and give reasons why the *bread* is called *Christ's Body* and the *wine* His *Blood.* But his reply fails altogether in meeting the argument. The force of the argument lies in this, that the *bread itself* is called Christ's Body and the *wine itself* His Blood. But Dr. Pusey answers the argument as if it was this, that the *sacrament* is called Christ's Body, and then (giving his own interpretation to the word *sacrament*) runs off to show that a thing *compounded of two parts* may be called by the name of one of them; and that the Fathers "called the whole [sacrament] by the name of the inward part, which makes it what it is;" (p. xvii.) which is altogether wide of the mark, and totally misses the force of the argument to which it professes to be a reply. All the pages therefore he has spent on this point are altogether thrown away. And my statement, that "the fact that the signs are called by the names of the things signified sweeps away at once the larger portion of Dr. Pusey's testimonies," to which Dr. Pusey takes exception (p. xxvii.), remains untouched.

The capital and essential defect that pervades the whole of Dr. Pusey's argumentation, is his affixing a certain meaning of his own to the terms used in his argument, and then arguing as if that was the acknowledged meaning. The reader is thus misled as to the very point in dispute, which often, perhaps generally, is, whether those terms do mean what Dr. Pusey has assumed to be their meaning.

Thus, for instance, he says,—

> "Mr. Goode frequently excepts against the belief in the oral reception of the Holy Eucharist. Isidore, embodying in his own statement the words of St. Augustine, states it as explicitly as words could express it: 'that in honour of so great a Sacrament the Lord's Body should enter the mouth of a Christian before any other food.'" (p. xxv.)

Now, in this passage there is a double attempt to mislead the reader; for according to the sense in which the terms "Holy Eucharist" and "the Lord's Body" are understood by

Dr. Pusey's opponents, I have, of course, never excepted against the belief in the oral reception of the former; and Isidore states nothing of the kind imputed to him by Dr. Pusey. And this is an apt specimen of the unfairness of the mode of argumentation usually adopted by Dr. Pusey and his party, which renders it impossible for any one, perusing their works alone, to have an idea of the nature of the points in dispute, and is clearly intended to make the reader suppose, that their adversaries deny the most obvious truths, and fly in the face of the clearest statements; while the real state of the case is, that certain interpretations are affixed to certain terms, and those who do not use those terms in such a sense are made the subjects of charges, the truth or falsehood of which depends entirely on the correctness or incorrectness of the *assumed* meaning of the terms used. To tell his readers that I deny the oral reception of the Holy Eucharist, is like telling them that I deny that black is black, with the secret meaning that he understands black to be grey, and that I do not believe it to be grey.

As to the extract from Isidore, if *the context* had been given, there could not have been quoted, as I have already shown,[1] a passage more clearly showing the error of Dr. Pusey in affixing the meaning he does to the words he has cited; for Isidore immediately afterwards says,—"*Bread*, inasmuch "as it strengthens the body, is therefore *called the Body of* "*Christ*; but *wine*, inasmuch as it produces blood in the "flesh, is therefore referred (or, likened) to the blood of "Christ."

And so again, in order to get rid of objections, a terminology is adopted which may enable Dr. Pusey to hold his doctrine, and at the same time deliver him from the necessity of meeting the difficulties attaching to it. Thus he says,— "In the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ do "not (as Mr. Goode often represents us as teaching) form "one whole [i. e. with the bread and wine] *except sacra-*

[1] See my work on the Eucharist, p. 242, where other testimonies will be found of the sense in which such terms were used by the Fathers.

"*mentally*. There is no physical union of the Body and "Blood of Christ with the bread and wine." (p. xvii.) But what is the meaning of the words "*except sacramentally*?" Dr. Pusey holds that the two are so united that they necessarily go together into the mouth of the communicant. Whether Dr. Pusey chooses to call this union sacramental, or wonderful, or transcendental, or incomprehensible, or anything else, is a matter of indifference. The fact of such a union is the question in dispute. And to give it an ambiguous or incomprehensible epithet, in order to make it unassailable, is useless, except to mislead the reader.

And when he adds,—"Where the consecrated bread is, "there, sacramentally, is the Body of Christ; where the con- "secrated wine is, there, sacramentally, is the Blood of "Christ;" I reply,—Of course; but what is the meaning of the word "sacramentally?"

In an argumentative point of view, a work so written is wholly useless. It may mislead an incompetent or unwary reader, and form a convenient book of reference for a partizan; but in the way of argument and proof to one desirous of arriving at the truth, it is absolutely valueless. And hence, on the same ground, Dr. Pusey's work on the testimony of the Fathers, to which he refers with such apparently large expectations of the effects it is likely to produce, is noticed by the present Bishop of St. David's only as being one of those "compilations which are bringing the name of a *Catena* into suspicion and disrepute, as equivalent to *an organ of polemical delusion*." (Charge for 1857, p. 26.)

It is really difficult to understand how such a man as Dr. Pusey can be unconscious of the delusion he is practising on the unwary reader, in thus misleading him as to the point at issue; but the tone of deep feeling and almost child-like simplicity which characterizes the language he uses on the subject makes one unwilling to believe that he is conscious of it. But it must not be forgotten, that such a style has been often adopted by the advocates of all the errors and extravagances of the Church of Rome.

The first 160 pages of Dr. Pusey's work, and nine of the

appendix, are spent upon a discussion of the meaning of the *Advertisement* at the end of the first book of Homilies, to which I have already directed the attention of the reader.[1] And nothing, I think, can more clearly show the extremities to which Dr. Pusey is driven for the defence of his cause, than that certain words in a mere *Advertisement*, inserted in 1547 (before any of our reformed Formularies had been drawn up,) at the end of the first Book of Homilies, should be one of the chief authorities on which he depends to prove his doctrine to be the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England.

To a reference to this *Advertisement*, as an authority for determining the present doctrine of the Church of England, I raised two objections; the first and chief being, that from its position as a mere *Advertisement* or *Notice* appended to a book published in 1547, it formed no part of any of our authoritative Formularies, and was moreover opposed to the doctrine established by authoritative Formularies subsequently published; and the second, that the phrase referred to in it was the phrase ordinarily used here at the time of the publication of the *Advertisement* to express the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Now, the question of the admissibility of this *Advertisement* as an authoritative declaration of the doctrine of the Church of England, rests upon the validity or invalidity of the first objection; and on this point the only argument I can find in these 160 pages is, that if there had been a change of view in our ecclesiastical authorities, such that these words no longer expressed their doctrine, they would not have been allowed to remain at the end of the first Book of Homilies. Now, to say nothing of the absurdity of elevating a mere *Notice* of this kind to the position of an authoritative dogmatic declaration, Dr. Pusey has himself admitted a fact which overturns this argument. For he tells us that Cranmer, though holding, and intending to express by this *Advertisement*, the doctrine of the real presence in the bread and wine, afterwards went over to the Swiss School (pp. 10, 11). Did, then, Cranmer ex-

[1] See my work on the Eucharist, pp. 40—47.

punge the *Advertisement* after this change of view? No. What then is the necessary conclusion that follows? Clearly that this *Advertisement* was not regarded as a statement of any authority in our Church.

And, in fact, there cannot be a clearer proof that the phrase used in this *Advertisement* was a phrase which Cranmer considered as not only not used in any document of authority in our Church, but as opposed to her doctrine, than the passage I have already quoted from him; and of which Dr. Pusey, according to his usual custom of ignoring the strongest points of his opponents' argument, and dwelling upon matters more easily turned to his purpose, takes no notice. In reply to an assertion of Gardiner, in his own defence, that in the English Communion Book of 1549, it was said, "the Body and Blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine," Cranmer says,—"As concerning the form "of doctrine used in this Church of England in the Holy "Communion, that the Body and Blood of Christ be *under* "*the forms of bread and wine,* when you shall show the place "where this form of words is expressed, then shall you purge "yourself of that which in the meantime I take to be a *plain* "*untruth.*"[1]

Now if the *Advertisement* at the end of the first Book of Homilies had been of any authority as an exponent of the doctrine of the Church of England, and been, as Dr. Pusey asserts without the slightest authority, a statement in which Cranmer himself had "embodied" his belief in the doctrine of the real presence in the bread and wine, could he have used these words to Gardiner? If the form of words in question occurred in any formulary of authority in our Church, that was equivalent to their being in the "Communion Book." But Cranmer evidently repudiates the phrase altogether as one used by the Church of England.

In fact, it is obvious, that a mere announcement at the end of an authoritative Formulary, that the Authorities of the Church intend at some future time to publish a statement of

[1] Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner, Park. Soc. ed. p. 58.

doctrine on a particular subject, can bind nobody, even at the time when it is put forth. That it may be some indication of the views entertained *at the time* by the person who inserted it, is of course readily granted. But beyond that it cannot have the slightest force or value.

With respect to the question whether the phrase used in this *Advertisement* was or was not the phrase in ordinary use here at the time to express the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or whether, as Dr. Pusey spends 160 pages in maintaining, it was used to express the doctrine of the real presence in the bread and wine, their substance remaining, that is a matter of secondary importance. The history and meaning of the Augsburg Confession, to which Dr. Pusey devotes nearly the whole of the discussion, are points of interest which, if they affected the question at issue, I should be happy to discuss with Dr. Pusey. As it is, I shall leave the reader to choose between the long-established credit of Hospinian, whom I have followed in my reference to the matter, and that of Dr. Pusey.

That the phrase "under the forms of bread and wine" was, as I asserted,[1] the regular phrase used at that time by the Romanists for expressing the doctrine of Transubstantiation, I have already so fully proved[2] by extracts from contemporary authors, including Cranmer, that I do not think it necessary to add to them. And it is undeniable that the doctrine of Transubstantiation had not then been renounced by our Church. Nay, it is a historical fact, that two years after this, when the Bishops were drawing up the first Reformed Prayer-Book in 1549, there was "a long and earnest dispute among them, whether Transubstantiation should be established or rejected."[3]

And the question as to what Cranmer's precise views were in 1547 will not determine the meaning of this Advertisement, for the authorship of the Advertisement is not known; and such a notice, having no legal authority, might be inserted by any one to whom the office of editing the first book of homilies was entrusted; and certainly few among the authorities of our Church had then given up the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is clear, as I have just shown, that Cran-

[1] Work on the Eucharist, p. 43. [2] Ib. pp. 43—46. [3] See ib. p. 47.

mer altogether repudiated the phrase occurring in it as one to which our Church was committed, and shows by his language in several places respecting it, what he understood by it. And therefore it cannot be supposed that he inserted it.

The abstract questions, whether the phrase "under the forms of bread and wine" has been sometimes used to express the doctrine of the presence in the bread and wine, their substances remaining; and whether the Romanists sometimes *added* to this phrase an express declaration, that the substance of the bread and wine ceased to exist, and various similar questions, to the discussion of which Dr. Pusey would gladly lead us away, are altogether different from that which we are considering.

I do not, therefore, consider it at all necessary to dwell any longer on Dr. Pusey's remarks on this point, though, if our subject required it, there are various matters in his statements respecting it to which I should have to take exception.

Dr. Pusey proceeds to consider the testimony of our Formularies; but instead of replying to the arguments which had been adduced against his doctrine, and fairly meeting the evidence which is unfavourable to it, all he does is to put his own gloss on certain statements of those Formularies, and occasionally notice a few points in the arguments of his opponents, in which they appear to him the most vulnerable. His argumentation is the mere special pleading of a partial advocate, and not the general investigation of an impartial inquirer into the real character of the evidence as a whole.

Thus, in dealing with the Catechism, and commenting on the statement, that the inward part or thing signified is "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by *the faithful* in the Lord's Supper,"—where the common sense of every impartial reader tells him, that the words were meant to indicate that the Body and Blood of Christ were taken and received by *the faithful only*,—instead of fairly meeting the difficulty, Dr. Pusey gives several pages of cloudy circumlocution on the subject; and after the reader has been prepared by this previous mystification, the conclusion is hazarded,—"In receiving the outward

part we receive the inward, the Body and Blood; in receiving the inward part, we, if faithful, receive 'the grace.'" So that Dr. Pusey would fain have us suppose, that the Catechism maintains with him, that *all* receive the inward part, the Body and Blood, in receiving the outward; but the faithful alone receive *the grace* that flows from them. But this is directly contrary to what the Catechism really says, for it clearly limits the reception of *the Body and Blood* to "*the faithful.*"

The only possible mode of explaining away this statement of the Catechism, is, either to say with Archdeacon Denison, that the statement does not mean to deny that the Body and Blood of Christ may be received by the *unfaithful* just as much as by the faithful; or with one of his defenders, that the phrase "the faithful" merely means here all the baptized, that is, in fact, everybody who comes to communicate; both which explanations I willingly leave in the hands of the reader.

But this mode of dealing with the matter is certainly better than a mere mystification of it.

In Dr. Pusey's remarks on the teaching of the Communion Service there is really nothing which seems to me to call for notice. There are various statements which appear to me altogether incorrect, but as far as regards the great points now at issue, I am content to leave the matter with the observations I have already made on this Service in my work on the Eucharist.

Dr. Pusey proceeds to the XXXIX. Articles, and commences (p. 186) with a statement, for which he does not even cite any authority that bears out his remark, and which is altogether incorrect; namely, that Archbishop Parker was united with Bishop Geste and Bishop Chesney[1] in forming a party in the Church termed by their opponents "Lutherans or Semi-Papists." There is no pretext for so speaking of Archbishop Parker. And to say that Grindal and Horn, when "they professed to Bullinger that they retained their Episcopates to hinder 'a papistical or Lutherano-papistical ministry,'" were referring to "*those of whom Archbishop Parker was the representative,*" is to make an assertion with-

[1] So Dr. Pusey spells the name.

out the slightest foundation for it. And the letter of Parker, to which Dr. Pusey refers, stating that he and some others were "named great papists," shows that the name had reference only to his insisting upon the use of certain articles of dress, and matters of that kind. To class Parker with Geste and Chesney is a mere polemical device, for which there is not the slightest ground, and against it much, as Geste's letter given above clearly shows.

In the history of the formation of the Articles, as they now stand, Dr. Pusey has been led by Strype into the error of stating (p. 193) that Chesney and Geste both signed the Articles as they passed the Convocation of 1562. Neither signed those Articles, and the Articles of 1571 were never signed by Chesney.[1] This is an important fact in relation to our present subject.

As it respects Dr. Pusey's attempt to explain Article 28 in accordance with his doctrine, (he does not *here* touch Art. 29), the only argument which has any show of validity is that which he derives (pp. 203, 204) from Bishop Geste's statement in his letter to Cecil of the sense which he attributed to the words he introduced into it. To this argument I have already replied, and endeavoured to show that whatever Bishop Geste's private sentiments may have been, the Articles passed in a form which shows that the Bishops and Clergy, as a body, did not understand the 28th Article in the sense he gave it.

We see from Bishop Geste's own letter that he clearly saw that for the maintenance of his doctrine, that evil men receive the Body of Christ, it was necessary that in the statement of the 28th Article, that "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith," the word "profitably" should be inserted before "received," and he proposed the addition, and complained that Archbishop Parker had sought to obtain the sanction of the Queen to an Article, to which "the most part" of the Bishops had

[1] See Lamb's Historical Account of the XXXIX. Articles; a book several times referred to by Dr. Pusey himself, and where the signatures to the Articles are given in fac simile.

subscribed, stating that "evil men receive not the Body of Christ." But when the Articles appear, with the Queen's authority, the Article thus sanctioned by Parker and the subscribing Bishops is among them, and the word "profitably" *not* added to the 28th.

Can there be a clearer proof of the opposition of Parker and the subscribing Bishops to Geste's views, and of the meaning intended to be conveyed by the Articles?

If Bishop Geste really wrote the whole of the 28th Article with the view of drawing up a statement which should express both his own doctrine and that of the majority of the Bishops, it is clear that he attempted to do what was impossible. And the result was, that while he was compelled to word it so as to express the doctrine of the majority of the Bishops, he was obliged to leave himself only a non-natural construction to fall back upon in his defence. And when a revision of the Articles was in hand, and one openly and directly opposing his doctrine was about to be added, he applied to the Prime Minister to get the additional Article rejected, and *his own wording* of the 28th altered so as to express his doctrine, but without success.

Dr. Pusey tells his readers, that I have "ridiculed the belief that in the Holy Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ are present, yet not after the manner of a body," and seems to think he solves every difficulty by saying that the presence he advocates takes place "spiritually, sacramentally, Divinely, mystically, ineffably." (p. 204.) It would have been fairer to have stated, that I have quoted all our greatest divines, Bilson, Jeremy Taylor, Stillingfleet, &c., as ridiculing the notion; and wiser to have remembered, that the cumulation of these adverbs proves nothing. It is no proof that a real human body is inside a piece of bread remaining bread, because we are told that though it cannot be so in any way we can understand, it is so mystically, ineffably, unintelligibly, incomprehensibly, and so on.

The words of Bertram, which Dr. Pusey proceeds to quote, are altogether against him. For Bertram expressly says, that "*one and the same thing*" is in one respect bread and wine, and in another the Body and Blood of Christ. And it

is clear that he considers the elements to be the former corporally, and the latter in spiritual character and effect.

Dr. Pusey proceeds to consider the statement of the 28th Article, that "*the mean* whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *faith*," which, of course, is entirely irreconcileable with the notion that it is received and eaten by those who have *no faith*. And the way in which Dr. Pusey gets over the difficulty is by *substituting for this statement one of a totally different kind*, as he did in the case of the Catechism. He remarks,—"The Homily 'concerning "the Sacrament' gives a good commentary upon it, setting "forth why faith is essential *to the reception of the inward grace* "*of the Sacrament*." (p. 219.) But "the reception of the inward grace of the Sacrament" is, according to Dr. Pusey, a different and distinct act from the reception and eating of the Body of Christ, *the latter taking place where the former does not*, and the Article speaks of the *latter*. Dr. Pusey has therefore completely changed the nature of the proposition contained in the Article in order to make it square with his own doctrine. And he then seeks to *strain* in a similar way a very plain passage of one of the Homilies. The words of the Homily being,—"so that to think that without faith we "may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof, or that that is "the fruition of it, is but to dream a gross carnal feeding." Dr. Pusey actually fixes upon the words "enjoy" and "fruition" as showing that the writer meant that we *may* "*eat* and *drink* thereof," but not "*enjoy*" that eating and drinking! He says that the writer of the Homily "lays "down, that faith is essential, not to *any* reception of our "Lord's Body, but to '*the* fruition' of it, or the benefits "resulting from it. In that he denies, that 'eating without "faith' is '*the* fruition of it,' he even implies, that it may "be a *reception* of it, although not the *fruition* of it. He "lays the emphasis upon the words 'enjoy,' 'fruition.'" (p. 219.) "Faith is 'the mean,' according to him, by which "a man healthily receives the 'spiritual food' of the Body "and Blood of Christ" (ib.); where the word "healthily" is put in by Dr. Pusey so as to change entirely the character of the doctrine delivered.

Such is the way in which the plain statement of the Homily is explained away!

Dr. Pusey's argument from the Declaration respecting kneeling at the end of the Communion Service, I shall notice presently in connection with his citation of it on the subject of the adoration of Christ as present in the elements.

His remarks on another rubric which I have noticed I pass over, because he admits that I have not "laid much stress" upon it, and therefore it would be a waste of time to give a long and formal reply to them.

His argument that the rubrical direction as to the reverent reception of the remainder of the elements by some of the communicants "shows that the Church of England be-" lieves an abiding objective presence of the Body and Blood " of Christ in the elements, apart from the act of reception," (p. 231,) and that the direction as to the covering of the remainder of the consecrated elements with a fine linen cloth "contains the same doctrine," I leave to be disposed of by the reader. I confess to a feeling of impatience under the infliction of such apologies for arguments.

The 71 pages (pp. 240—311) spent by Dr. Pusey in proving that Art. 29 does not oppose the doctrine that the wicked eat the real flesh and blood of Christ present in the consecrated elements, may all be answered by a simple reference to those words of the Article, which Dr. Pusey, *throughout the whole of his disquisition, has carefully kept out of sight, and not even alluded to*. The mode adopted for explaining away the Article is, as may be supposed, the same as that adopted by Archdeacon Denison, namely, that when, in the title of the Article, it is said that the wicked "eat *not* the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," all that is meant is, that they do not eat it "IN SUCH A WAY that a man should thereby dwell in Christ and Christ in him." (pp. 251 and 255, 6.) And that the words in the body of the Article, that the wicked "in no wise are partakers of Christ," only mean that the wicked have not "a share of Him who dwells in the hearts of all those who are his by the Spirit," (p. 252,) that is, do not *profitably* receive Christ's flesh and blood.

Suppose that for the sake of argument this was granted.

What is Dr. Pusey's reason for *utterly ignoring and keeping out of sight* the remainder of the Article?

Could it be imagined from the way in which Dr. Pusey has treated the subject, that after the words that the wicked "in no wise are partakers of Christ," it is *immediately added*, "BUT RATHER, TO THEIR CONDEMNATION, DO EAT AND DRINK THE SIGN OR SACRAMENT OF SO GREAT A THING."

No words could more plainly and decisively enunciate the doctrine which Dr. Pusey is opposing, or oppose the doctrine which he cites the Article as maintaining. It is here distinctly affirmed, that instead of eating the body of Christ, or being partakers of Christ, the wicked eat only "*the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.*"

All the 71 pages, therefore, which Dr. Pusey has devoted to this point are merely lost labor. And, in fact, as might be supposed, his whole argumentation is based upon a *petitio principii*, a begging of the question, which renders it altogether valueless.

Thus, Dr. Pusey proceeds to tell us, that "over and above, we know that the framer of the Article meant to express no more" than the meaning he (Dr. P.) has assigned to it. (p. 257.) And how do we "know" this? Simply because Archbishop Parker, in a letter to Lord Burghley, stated in reply to an objection somebody had raised as to the reference to Augustine in this Article, that he still thought he was right in his reference to the words of Augustine, "concerning *so much wherefore they be alleged in the Article.*" And Dr. Pusey having pronounced *ex cathedra* what was the precise "so much wherefore they be alleged in the Article," jumps to his conclusion that the Archbishop only meant by the Article what he wishes it to mean.[1]

The long disquisition on the views of Augustine is of a similar kind. The key which unlocks the difficulties in the interpretation of passages which might appear to some readers inconsistent, is carefully kept out of sight. The terms used in these passages are *assumed* to mean what Dr. Pusey wishes us to understand by them. And of course the desired

[1] See more on this point in my Work on the Eucharist, pp. 659—664.

conclusion is easily arrived at. The reader who wishes to see another mode of dealing with these passages, will find it in my work on the Eucharist,[2] where I have examined them at length.

Dr. Pusey proceeds to defend the doctrine of the adoration of Christ as "present in the Holy Eucharist," that is, (according to the real meaning of those ambiguous terms, in the use of which the strength of Dr. Pusey's argument lies,) present in or under the bread and wine, so as to be eaten with them.

This doctrine I have not formally discussed, because if, as I have maintained, our Lord is not present in or under the bread and wine, of course such adoration is out of the question. But a few words on Dr. Pusey's argument on the point may not be out of place.

Dr. Pusey first endeavours to meet the statements of the Articles; and his mode of dealing with them is precisely that of Tract 90 and Francis a Sancta Clara.

His comment on the statements of Art. XXV. and XXVIII., that "the Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them," and that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's ordinance, reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped," is as follows:—

"The English Article [XXV.] is worded very carefully, and with remarkable moderation. Its framers were content with asserting what was necessary to justify our own practice, without condemning in others the reservation for the express purpose of adoration, which they did not think right to retain for the Church in England. The statement in Art. XXV. *only asserts that such was not the object for which our Saviour Christ ordained the Sacraments.* 'They were not ordained of Christ,' it says, 'to be gazed upon or to be carried about.' It does not even say, that this *may* [Dr. P.'s italics] not be done; only, that this was not *the* [Dr. P.'s italics] end for which it was ordained. Such also is the meaning of the statement in the 28th Article, although grammatically it is cast in a different form. 'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's ordinance, reserved,' &c. *The Article clearly did not mean to condemn all reservation of the Holy Eucharist, e. g., for the*

[2] See pp. 350—365 and 515—525.

sick." . . . . . "Our Articles stop short with the assertion, that our Lord Jesus Christ did not institute the Holy Eucharist *for the purpose* of being 'reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped,' but that it should be duly received. She justified her own omission of those acts, by laying down (in which the Council of Trent agrees with her) that our Lord did not institute the Sacrament *for that end.*" (pp. 312, 313.)

So that, according to Dr. Pusey, these Articles do not intend to prohibit these things being done, but all which they mean is, that *Christ did not ordain* that these things should be done. Notwithstanding what these Articles say, the Sacraments may be reserved, carried about, and worshipped, as the Romanists do, but we must not assert that *Christ ordained* that they should be so reserved, carried about, and worshipped. To an unsophisticated mind, there needs, I am convinced, no answer to all this, and I would rather not dwell upon it.

Dr. Pusey, in his concluding remarks about the reservation of the Sacrament, has, I suppose, quite forgotten, that a rubric at the end of the Communion Service specially directs, that "if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not "be carried out of the Church, but the priest and such other "of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, "immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the "same."

But Dr. Pusey thinks that another argument may be raised out of these words in his favour. He says,—

"But further, the Article says, that 'the *sacrament* was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.' It says nothing whatever about the adoration of *Christ* in the Sacrament. It excepts, at most, against a later custom, and adoration connected with it. By no honest interpretation can this be extended to a worship, *not* of the *Sacrament*, but of Christ present there." (p. 315. The italics are Dr. Pusey's.)

Now, if Christ is present in an adorable form inside the bread, so that the two form (call the union sacramental, or what you will) *one whole*, that one whole is a legitimate object of worship, just as Jesus Christ was a proper object of worship. We ought to bow down to that which lies upon the

Communion table as the sacrament, because, according to Dr. Pusey, Christ forms a part of it. And, according to Dr. Pusey, Christ is as much present in the bread, and joined to it, as the second Person of the Godhead was to the human nature in the person of Jesus Christ, for thus he speaks,—

"People have PROFANELY *spoken of* '*wafer-gods.*' They might as well have spoken of 'fire-gods,' of the manifestation of God in the flaming fire in the bush; or 'light-gods,' of his manifestation in the tabernacle and the temple; or 'human-gods' or 'angel-gods,' of his appearance to the patriarchs and prophets. *Much more, might they have used the title,* '*Infant-god,*' *as a term of reproach against the* '*Holy Child Jesus.*'" (p. 329.)

According to this doctrine, then, as the Second Person of the adorable Trinity was connected with the human nature in the person of Jesus Christ, so is Christ with the wafer in the Sacrament!

"The simple question," adds Dr. Pusey, "is, 'Is our Lord and God present there? If, or rather since, He is present there, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress which he wore as man." "Where God's Almighty Word causes his body to be, in whatever mode of being, there his Godhead is, because it is inseparable; there is Christ himself." (pp. 329, 330.)

So that, as whole Christ, God and Man, forms part of that Sacrament which is to be eaten by the mouth, the mouth receives into it the Godhead as well as the manhood of Christ!

The only other authority alleged against him which Dr. Pusey thinks it necessary to meet, is the Declaration at the end of the Communion Service; and his mode of meeting it is merely the common one of explaining away the words "corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood," by saying that the word "corporal" here must be understood to mean "material," and therefore that the denial of adoration to *such* a presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood does not exclude the adoration of an *immaterial* presence.

But it is only necessary to read the whole rubric to see the invalidity of this mode of meeting the argument derivable from it against Dr. Pusey's doctrine. For if there

were such a presence in the elements as Dr. Pusey supposes, the posture of kneeling would be a proper act of adoration to Christ as so present. Dr. Pusey holds "that the adoration of our Lord thus present is the legitimate consequence of the belief in that Presence." But the whole object of the Declaration is to point out, that the act of kneeling is not an act of adoration to Christ as so present, but "a signification of our "humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of "Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the "avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy "Communion as might otherwise ensue." [1]

And a similar reason for such a posture is assigned in the seventh of the Canons of 1640, drawn up under the presidency of Archbishop Laud, where such a gesture "in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist" is said to be not "upon "any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus "Christ on the holy table, or in mystical elements, *but only* "for the advancement of God's Majesty, and to give him "alone that honour and glory that is due unto him, and *no* "*otherwise.*" [2]

In the face of all this, to say that the rubric only means, that the kneeling is not an act of adoration to a *material* kind of presence, but that it may be used as an act of adoration to an *immaterial* kind of presence, in the elements, is a mode of interpretation upon which I leave the reader to pass judgment.

I now add a few remarks on the attempts of Archdeacon Denison and some others to discredit my work without answering it.

Archdeacon Denison's sole reply to my whole work consists of the following paragraph, occurring in a pamphlet he published shortly after the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on his case.

"I have two things to say upon Mr. Goode's book, 'The nature

[1] See more on this point in my work on the Eucharist, pp. 621—626 and 31—40.

[2] Cardwell's Synod. i. 406.

of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, or, the True Doctrine of the Real Presence Vindicated.'

"1. Mr. Goode has said some things of me which not only have no foundation in fact, but are directly contrary to previously published fact. *E. g.*, he says: 'The adoration of the elements is expressly taught by the Archdeacon.' And other things in like manner. (p. 675, &c. See also pages 54, 5.) Now the only two places where I have said *anything* about the worship due, are, (1) the place quoted above, p. 12, from Serm. II. Criminal Articles 12, 13, 14; and (2) the last of my eight Propositions, see below, pp. 24, 5. In both places I *expressly deny in terms* 'the adoration of the elements.' Is it possible for any misstatement to be more recklessly false than that here made by Mr. Goode?

"2. Mr. Goode charges me with gross ignorance in respect of the following statement in my note to Preface to Sermon II. p. 43. (See his book, p. 594.) 'The test that those who receive unworthily receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and *therein* and *thereby* "eat and drink their own damnation," is not consistent with Lutheran doctrine.' I collect from Mr. Goode's remark, that his conception of the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist is the popular conception. It would appear plainly that it cannot be the true one. What Luther taught is—That our Lord's gift of his own Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist is a sign or testimony to faith—so that, according to him, it is, not the Body and Blood of Christ present to the believing, but, the faith of the believing, which is the blessing: and it is, not the Body and Blood of Christ present to the unbelieving, but, the want of faith in the unbelieving, which is the curse. I submit that the statement of my note is accurate and precise." [1]

I have given the whole passage, that there may be no pretence for a charge of misrepresentation.

Now, as it respects the first point, the reader shall be judge on whom rests the guilt of "recklessly false misstatement."

The passage in my work, to which Archdeacon Denison refers, occurs in connexion with an extract from Bishop Burnet, in which *he* speaks of "an adoration of the elements" being "taught and practised" under the doctrines of Consubstantia-

[1] Some Remarks upon the Dictum of the Pro-Diocesan Court assembled at Bath, &c &c. Lond. 1858. 8vo. pp. 14—16.

tion and Transubstantiation; the meaning of which is, of course, abundantly plain, namely, that acts of worship are performed towards the bread and wine, under the false notion of their being changed into, or joined with, the real body and blood of Christ. And my words,—*pointing out, in the most clear and express terms, the precise view of Archdeacon Denison,*—are these:—

"Now this, as we have seen, is expressly taught both by Archdeacon Denison and Archdeacon Wilberforce, as well as by some at least of the Lutherans, and in fact legitimately follows from the doctrine of Consubstantiation as well as Transubstantiation. *No doubt the authors under review, like the Romanists, would object to the phrase 'adoration of the elements,' on the ground that they do not worship the elements, but the Body and Blood of Christ in, or under the form of, the elements.* But this is a mere subterfuge. *It is not meant by this phrase that they worship the substance of bread and wine, but that they fall down in worship before what is really only bread and wine, as if it contained in it or under its forms the real Body and Blood of Christ.* And as Bishop Burnet justly observes,—'We ought to consider this action as it is in itself, and not according to men's apprehensions and opinions about it. If the conceits that the ancient idolaters had both concerning their gods and the idols that they worshipped, will excuse from idolatry, it will be very hard to say that there were ever any idolaters in the world. Those who worshipped the sun, thought that the great Divinity was lodged there, as in a vehicle or temple, but yet they were not, by reason of that misconception, excused from being idolaters.'" [1]

The reader may now judge for himself how far the statement to which Archdeacon Denison refers deserves the character he has given to it of a "recklessly false misstatement."

It will be well for the Archdeacon to remember, that such a statement as he has here *deliberately* made is hardly entitled even to the plea of recklessness as an apology.

On the second point, I have merely to say, that the Archdeacon has here given abundant additional proof that my charge against him, that "he has not a notion what the Lu-

[1] See my Work on the Eucharist, p. 675.

theran doctrine is" (for the phrase "gross ignorance" is the Archdeacon's, and not mine), is perfectly true. It is, in fact, wonderful how any man having a character to maintain in the literary world could sit down and so stultify himself as to give such a description of "what Luther taught." It would be a waste of time to enter further upon the matter, because the Confessions and Theological Works by which such a statement is to be tested, are so common, that any one who wishes to ascertain the truth, may without difficulty do so.

I turn next, for a few minutes, to the Rev. C. S. Grueber's pamphlet, entitled, in the very characteristic phraseology of the author, "A Second Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, being an Exposure of the Rev. W. Goode's Book;" with a motto, the awful profanity of which is really startling, "We believe that THOU shalt come to be our Judge."

To drag the reader through all the fallacies and absurdities of this performance, is far from being my intention. From beginning to end, it is simply a passionate invective of one who hoped, by indiscriminate abuse and vehement charges of misrepresentation, to hinder the perusal of my Work on the Eucharist. But a brief notice of some parts of it, especially those in which he has accused me of misrepresenting the Archdeacon's views, may not be without its use. On all the great questions connected with the point in dispute, I am perfectly willing to leave the reader to judge between the arguments and authorities I have adduced on the subject, and the statements (I will give them no name) by which Mr. Grueber has attempted to answer them. In the case of any reader who prefers abiding by Mr. Grueber's *dicta*, to weighing the evidence on both sides, any reply on my part would be useless; while with one of a different kind, I am content to leave the case to be decided by what I have already written.

A few words, then, on his charges against me, of misrepresenting the Archdeacon's doctrine.

The first is, that I have represented as the doctrine of the Archdeacon, "That the natural Body and Blood of Christ

"being present in the consecrated elements, and being re-
"ceived into the 'mouth' of all communicants, is eaten 'cor-
"porally' and 'received into the belly.'" This he calls a "gross misrepresentation," "unpardonable," "a false charge." (p. 8.)

Of course, if the object of Mr. Grueber had been to deal fairly, my own words would have been given; and I have taken good care not to express the Archdeacon's doctrine in such loose language. But if, after the word "present," the words "in a spiritual and immaterial form" are added, and the phrase "eaten 'corporally,'" is taken to mean, "eaten by the mouth," then I am quite willing to take the statement as expressing what I have alleged to be the doctrine of the Archdeacon, and what the doctrine of the Archdeacon *undeniably is*. And the effrontery which denies it is even more astonishing than the absurdity of the thing itself. Indeed, what possible purpose it can answer to deny it, when the very essence of the Archdeacon's doctrine is, that the real body of Christ is, in a spiritual and immaterial form, in the bread and eaten with it, I cannot conceive. And the fact is, that though the word "mouth" is not used in this connexion in the Archdeacon's Sermons, yet in the treatise of Saravia, which he himself has put forth as exactly expressing his doctrine, and which Mr. Grueber himself tells us (p. 56) expresses that doctrine, this doctrine of the oral manducation of Christ's body is over and over again laid down. Saravia having described the sacrament as "compounded from the bread and the flesh of Christ," says, "The same sacrament, the whole sacra-
"ment, robbed of no part of itself, is *in the mouth of all, good
"and bad;* the same outward thing equally sacred and divine
"in all cases is, together with the inward and heavenly thing,
"that is, the flesh and blood of Christ, given to and received
"by the good and the bad alike." "I look upon them all as of
"one class, whoever they may be, who will not believe that
"the Lord's bread in the sacred Supper is his *true natural
"body*, which the godless man or a Judas, as much even as a
"St. Peter, or any other saint, *receives into his mouth.*" [1]

[1] See these and other similar extracts in my Work on the Eucharist. ch. 5. pp. 229, 230.

And Archdeacon Denison himself tells us, that in the publication of this work of Saravia, "his purpose has been to call "attention to the fact, that many great divines of the Church "of England have, in their writings, at the time of the Re- "formation as before and since, maintained *the precise teach- "ing which is now charged against him as false doctrine and a "depravation of the Articles.*"[1]

The second charge of misrepresentation is, "That notwith- "standing the Archdeacon has refused even to entertain any "consideration of the eating of the consecrated elements by "brute beasts, as also irreverent and profane, Mr. Goode, as "Counsel had done before him, attempts to fix upon him, as "being his very doctrine, the revolting statements, that "'under the form of Bread and Wine the true and real Body "of Christ may be devoured of dogs, hogs, cats, and rats;'" which he calls "a perverse representation;" and characteristically proceeds thus: "My Lord, I tremble while I read "and write such things; and nothing but the necessity of "exposing the profane, indecent, and false statements of the "volumes under consideration would induce me here to insert "them." (p. 8.)

The truth of this charge may be at once tested by any reader who will turn to pp. 49 and 191 of my Work, where I have noticed this point, and where, having urged the objection that this is *a consequence* necessarily flowing from the Archdeacon's doctrine (which is, of course, a legitimate mode of arguing), so far from charging the Archdeacon with formally maintaining it, I have given *his own words* on the subject, and found fault with him for *declining to give* any opinion on the subject.

My words are these:—

"If the Body and Blood of Christ are so joined to the Bread and Wine that the mouth of every communicant in receiving one necessarily receives the other, then brute animals eating and drinking the bread and wine receive the Body and Blood of Christ. This objection is noticed by Archdeacon Denison, and the only reply he can give to it (as I have noticed, p. 49 above[2]) is, that we are not

[1] See ibid. p. 229.

[2] In that page I have given his precise words.

told what the consecrated elements may be to the brute creation, and therefore cannot affirm anything on the subject. The reader therefore will observe, that instead of shrinking back with horror from such a notion, the Archdeacon is satisfied with declining to give any formal opinion upon the point. It may be so, or it may not, he thinks; and with that expression of indifference upon the subject, he is content. That the blessed and glorified body of the living and exalted Saviour should be taken by a brute animal into his mouth and swallowed and passed into his stomach, is a doctrine upon the truth or falsehood of which he feels himself unable to decide." (p. 191.)

This statement Mr. Grueber, having first worded it after his own fashion, and put *his own* words within inverted commas, stigmatizes as "profane, indecent, and false," and "trembles while he reads and writes such things." But the deliberate statement of Archdeacon Denison, that he cannot undertake to say that it is not so, and that the glorified body of Christ may not pass into the mouth of a brute animal, he can *defend without "trembling."* I leave the reader to make his own comments on all this.

The third charge of misrepresentation is, that I have stated, "That the adoration of the elements is expressly taught by the Archdeacon," which Mr. Grueber politely designates "a wilful and deliberate falsehood." (p. 9.)

Having already, in my reply given above to Archdeacon Denison himself, noticed this point, I shall not trouble the reader here with any further remarks upon it.

Such are the grounds upon which Mr. Grueber charges me with misrepresenting the doctrine of the Archdeacon, and writing a work against notions which the Archdeacon does not hold. My "entire argument," he tells his readers, "is "a remarkable instance of what logicians call the 'ignoratio "elenchi;' that is to say, the doctrines which Mr. Goode "states as being the doctrines of the Archdeacon, and against "which he brings proof and cites authorities, are not the "doctrines of the Archdeacon." (p. 3.) And yet, wonderful to say, Mr. Grueber proceeds to show in defence of the Archdeacon, that my arguments and authorities against those

doctrines are not valid,—a very useless and unprofitable task, if those doctrines are not the doctrines of the Archdeacon. Mr. Grueber should have contented himself with adopting one plea or the other; by adopting both, he has clearly shown us what his own opinion is as to the nature of the former plea.

Mr. Grueber's vocabulary, of which I have just given some specimens, I leave in his own possession. But I may just commend to the reader's attention and nomenclature the following statements.

Mr. Grueber tells his readers, (p. 9,) that I assert, "That the sacrament does not consist of two parts, but of one part, and that this one part constitutes the whole sacrament;" in revenge, I suppose, for my having pointed out to the reader that the word sacrament is used in two senses, sometimes as meaning only the outward part or sign, and sometimes as referring to the outward part or sign together with the inward or thing signified, and warned him against being misled by the attempts of the Archdeacon to affix to the word the latter as the exclusive sense.

At p. 21, having referred to an expression in the Communion Service of 1549, which he tells us was altered in 1552, and altered back again in 1662, (which is a most incorrect and erroneous representation of the matter, but I pass over that now,) he deliberately tells his readers that "Mr. Goode says, 'The expression was carefully expunged or altered,'" &c. &c., when the fact is, that *I have never referred to the passage at all.*

I have stated that all those expressions in the Prayer Book of 1549, which might seem to indicate that the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ was to be looked for in the consecrated elements, are carefully expunged or altered in the subsequent Prayer-Books to the present time, and I have *pointed out what those expressions are.* But the expression referred to by Mr. Grueber is, as he well knows, having my work before him, *not one of them;* but one of the straws caught at by his client the Archdeacon, at the Bath Trial, to save him from sinking. I have taken not the slightest notice of it, because it did not deserve it.

One of the favourite arguments of the Archdeacon and his party is derived from the *Advertisement* appended to the First Book of Homilies in 1547, before the doctrine of Transubstantiation had been renounced by the English Church, stating, "Hereafter shall follow sermons of fasting," &c. And in pointing out the absurdity of referring to this *Advertisement* as containing the present doctrine of the English Church, or forming any part of the Homilies, I made the remark, "This *Advertisement*, though of course forming no part "of the Homilies, was repeated by succeeding printers in "their editions of the Book, even after the second Book "had been added, in which a Homily had been given on "the subject, maintaining a totally different doctrine from "that implied in these words." (p. 41.) Of course it is obvious, that when the *promised* "sermons on fasting &c." were *actually added*, the Advertisement was superfluous and useless, and had no object to be answered by its continuance, but was reprinted with the rest simply because there was no formal order issued for its withdrawal.

This *Advertisement* Mr. Grueber tells his readers "Mr. Goode is not ashamed to *call* a *printer's* note." (p. 29.)

And, making this *Advertisement* part of a homily, he gravely accuses me of "impugning the Homily," and "thereby impugning the truth of the XXXVth Article," and asks whether I "can be ignorant that the XXXVth Article contains" a "confirmation of the First Book of Homilies;" and "submits it to His Grace's consideration," whether I have not thus myself done what the Archdeacon was accused of doing, namely, "advisedly maintained what is contrary and repugnant to the XXXVth Article of Religion." !! (pp. 32, 33.)

So that after all my reiterated efforts, both in this and other controversies, to get the doctrine of the Homilies respected and their authority recognized, my non-recognition of the authority of this *Advertisement* makes me an impugner of the Homilies, and consequently a depraver of the Article that gives them authority!

But this is not by any means the most wonderful discovery Mr. Grueber has made of my delinquencies; for he has found out that I have "depraved" Art. XXVIII. as well as Art.

XXXV. And thus he proves it:—"The Article affirms—'The "Body of Christ is given, taken, eaten, only after a spiritual "and heavenly manner,' I. E. *that the Presence in the Sacra-* "*ment is not as it is said 'corporal,' but spiritual.* Now Mr. "Goode does not only deny this position, but ridicules it as "a metaphysical absurdity. It remains then to be con- "sidered, whether Mr. Goode has not depraved this Article "28 as well as Article 35." (p. 40.)

But then, unfortunately for Mr. Grueber, all depends here upon the value of the "I. E.," and some perhaps will not take Mr. Grueber's word for it, that he has *quite* hit the meaning of the Article. And one cannot but feel, that amidst all these charges there are some secret misgivings in Mr. Grueber's own mind upon the matter, for otherwise how is it that a trial in a Court of Law puts him and his friends in such a fright, that every effort is made to prevent such a Court having an opportunity of even hearing such a case upon its merits?

One more assertion of Mr. Grueber respecting my Work seems to require notice. After stating that the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison "is taught in some passages of the Books of Homilies," he adds in the margin, "Refer to Mr. Goode's work, WHICH ADMITS THIS:" (p. 43.) the real fact being that four pages of my work (pp. 637—641) are expressly devoted to a formal proof that the testimony of the Homilies is entirely condemnatory of the Archdeacon's doctrine.

On all this I leave the reader to form his own opinion.

There are two other passages in Mr. Grueber's pamphlet which it may be well to notice, one as a specimen of his theology, and the mode in which he is prepared to carry out what he admits to be the rule of our Church, namely, that "the XXXIX Articles are to be taken in their literal and grammatical sense;" the other as a test of the degree of confidence to be placed in his literary statements.

On p. 34, he asserts that "*the literal meaning of Article xi.* "*would be directly repugnant or contrary to Holy Scripture;* for "Article xi. says, 'That we are justified by faith only is a "most wholesome doctrine.'"

On p. 55, after noticing my argument that Bishop Poynet

(or, Ponet) could not be the author of the "Diallacticon," Mr. Grueber places in the margin the following note:—"*By "reference at the British Museum, the author has since discovered, "that the Diallacticon is cited as Bishop Poynet's in Bishop "Ridley's 'Declaration of the Lord's Supper.'*"

I need hardly mention to any one who has the slightest acquaintance with these matters, that Bishop Ridley *suffered martyrdom in* 1555, *two years before the "Diallacticon" made its appearance.* A research in the British Museum, by a professedly literary man, ending in such a "discovery," has in it so much of the ludicrous, that I confess I think my own time and that of the reader may be better bestowed than in following the lucubrations of Mr. Grueber any further.

One word as to the review of my work in the "Guardian."

The competency and fitness of the Reviewer in the "Guardian" may be judged of by the following specimen. I will give the passage at length, that the reader may see the *style* and *tone* of the Review as well as the nature of the credit due to its statements and arguments.

The Reviewer[1] writes thus:—

"Besides acuteness and correct perception in apprehending the meaning of others, some acquaintance with their works is necessary for appreciating their testimony. Now of the degree of confidence to be placed in Mr. Goode's assumption of familiar acquaintance with the Fathers, and of critical learning, the following will be a sufficient evidence. It is the very first passage which meets us in his examination of Dr. Pusey's Patristic authorities; so we take it as a specimen. Dr. Pusey cited a well-known passage out of St. Ignatius's Epistle to the Church of Smyrna. Mr. Goode says, (p. 467,) 'This passage is *not found in most of the Greek MSS. of this Epistle*, but it occurs in the Medicean MS.' Why, the veriest tyro in these subjects knows that there is ONLY ONE Greek MS. of these 'genuine' Epistles, and that is the Medicean. Every one who has dabbled in the controversy about Syriac versions knows this. Yet in this state of ignorance . . . Mr. Goode writes," &c. &c.

[1]. Guardian for Nov. 19, 1856.

And after quoting the passage in my work to which he alludes, the writer adds,—"It is amusing, after this, to read Mr. Goode's 'learned' *ex cathedra* disquisition on the genuineness of the writings of St. Cyril."

Let us now see what are the facts of the case as to the matter respecting which, according to the Reviewer, my statement shows my profound "ignorance," and is "sufficient evidence" of my utter want of acquaintance with the Fathers, so as to render any further remarks on them by me simply "amusing."

Now, in the first place, my statement is taken from a note on the passage by one of the most learned editors of Ignatius, Dr. Smith, who writes thus, "Tota hæc sectio omittitur in "vulgatis Græcis Codd. quum Codex Mediceus conservavit "integram, uti et Theodoretus, et vetus noster Interpres." This alone probably would satisfy the reader as to the correctness of my remark. It is, in fact, not mine, but Dr. Smith's.

But again, our learned Bishop Pearson, in his "Vindiciæ," says on this very point, "Primus [Chemnitius] observavit, "locum ex Epistola ad Smyrnæos citatum a Theodoreto, nec "*in Græcis codicibus* nec in Latinis reperiri," &c.

So Bellarmine, (as quoted by Pearson) speaking of the omission of this passage in the Greek of Ignatius as he then had it, uses the words, "non esse magnam fidem habendam "*Codicibus Græcis qui nunc exstant*, quando discrepant a La-"tinis."

Moreover, two of the earlier editions of Ignatius, namely, those by Gesner (Tigur. 1560) and Pacæus (Diling. 1557) were printed, respectively, from two different Greek MSS., the localities of which are described by the editors.

That the Medicean MS. is supposed to give these Epistles in their genuine form, and the others to present them in an interpolated form, is a question which has nothing to do with the fact which I have stated, and which, as the reader has seen, is mentioned in similar terms by Dr. Smith, Bishop Pearson, and Cardinal Bellarmine.

In what position these facts place the Reviewer, I leave the

reader to judge, and which of us is most likely to "amuse" the reader by our critical remarks on such subjects.

To analyze the whole article, where a man writes in this style, would be a waste of time. Its recklessness of assertion may be judged of by the fact that, alluding to certain divines whom he cannot deny to have held the doctrine I maintain, he states,—"Mr. Goode is not content with these classes of "divines, he would have it that *all are of his mind:* and not "only this but the Fathers also," simply because I have maintained their *opposition* to Archdeacon Denison's doctrine. And the writer, like Mr. Grueber, glorying in the opportunity which the ludicrous self-contradictions of Archdeacon Denison, &c. gave him of accusing me of misrepresenting them, and of inconsistency in my charges against them, runs out at length into this theme, so that a reader unacquainted with the subject would have no notion of the real state of the case; which of course is the object in view. I have actually, it seems, accused Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey of holding "a corporal or bodily presence," though they "protest against this in every possible way;" and I have told Archdeacon Denison that no one accuses him of saying that there is a *material* presence of Christ's body in the bread, while in another place I have said that his doctrine involves the notion of a material substance in the Eucharist beyond the bread; and so on. Very shocking misrepresentation and inconsistency all this, no doubt, in the eyes of those who know not what the statements are which I had to meet; but men who have not given themselves over to a spirit of delusion on such matters, will, I suspect, agree with me, that if there is a real substantial presence of the body of Christ in the bread, there is a bodily presence, and that the presence of Christ's human body involves the presence of a material substance; and that we are not to be deterred from saying so, because these authors, finding inconvenient articles and rubrics in their way, deny in one *form* of words, what they assert in another.

But enough of such a production.

The whole article, in its display of ignorance and self-conceit,

is most characteristic of the party from whom it emanates, and of the Newspaper in which it appeared, whose articles seem to be principally supplied by young devotees of the Tractarian party, employed to write down, *quocunque modo*, everything that is likely to damage their school of doctrine.

The above-mentioned are, as far as I am aware, the only critical notices of my work which require any remark from me. How far the arguments and authorities I have adduced in my work are affected by them, I leave the reader to judge. All that I desire is, that those arguments and authorities should be judged of by a perusal of them, as stated by myself, and not as perverted by the misrepresentations of angry and untrustworthy opponents.

The most painful characteristic of the Tractarian Controversy from its commencement has been the want of regard for the requirements of truth. The great leader of the Tractarians, Mr. Newman, set out upon the avowed maxim (laid down in his "History of the Arians") that to "speak falsely" to gain a good end, is a sound principle of action; and the legitimate result of such a state of mind was seen in No. 90, and the whole train of like-principled publications that have followed it. And our Church is now labouring under all the evils, which a school of divines, trained in such principles, is calculated to inflict upon it. Her Formularies are distorted, her great divines misrepresented, and the whole Controversy conducted with a single eye to the one great object in view, the promotion by any means of what is miscalled *Catholic* doctrine.

Lately published, by the same Author,

In Two Volumes, Octavo, price 24s., cloth,

THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST: or, the True Doctrine of the Real Presence vindicated in opposition to the fictitious Real Presence asserted by Archdeacon Denison, Mr. (late Archdeacon) Wilberforce, and Dr. Pusey; with full proof of the real character of the attempt made by those Authors to represent their doctrine as that of the Church of England and her Divines. By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of St. Margaret Lothbury, London.

London: Published by T. Hatchard, 187, Piccadilly.

PRESENTED
BY THE
Church of England
Book Society,
11, ADAM STREET, LONDON.
FOUNDED 1880.

Treasurer.
FRANK A. BEVAN, ESQ.

Secretary.
JOHN SHRIMPTON, ESQ.